This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

00099738%

nuals of Religious Instruction

for Pupil Teachers.

EDITED BY

JOHN PILKINGTON

CANON OF

THE OL

TH

MANUALS OF

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

FOR

pil Teachers

EDITED BY

NORRIS, M.A.

CANON OF BRISTOL

600099738%

Manuals of Religious Instruction for Pupil Teachers.

EDITED BY

JOHN PILKINGTON NORRIS, M.A.

CANON OF BRISTOL.

THE OLD TESTAMENT. Five Parts.

THE NEW TESTAMENT. Five Parts.

THE PRAYER BOOK. Five Parts.

Small 8vo. 1*s. each Part.*

MANUALS OF

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

FOR

Pupil Teachers

EDITED BY

J. P. NORRIS, M.A.
CANON OF BRISTOL

RIVINGTONS

London.....*Waterloo Place*

Oxford.....*High Street*

Cambridge.....*Trinity Street*

[*All rights reserved.*]

[A—135]

THE CATECHISM

AND LITURGY

BY THE EDITOR

J. P. NORRIS, M.A.

CANON OF BRISTOL

FIFTH YEAR'S COURSE

RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MDCCCLXXV

13983 f 36

BODLEIAN LIBRARY
OXF

Contents

THE XXXIX. ARTICLES.

LESSON		ARTICLES	PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTORY		1
II.	THE THREE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD	i—v.	9
III.	THE BIBLE AND CREEDS	vi.	21
IV.	THE BIBLE AND CREEDS—*CONTINUED*	vii. viii.	32
V.	SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN	ix—xi.	39
VI.	SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN—*CONTINUED*	xii—xv.	48
VII.	SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN—*CONTINUED*	xvi—xviii.	58
VIII.	THE CHURCH	xix. xx.	69
IX.	THE CHURCH—*CONTINUED*	xxi—xxiv.	77
X.	THE SACRAMENTS—BAPTISM	xxv—xxvii.	86
XI.	THE LORD'S SUPPER	xxviii—xxxi.	96
XII.	THE RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE	xxxii—xxxix.	104

LESSON I.

INTRODUCTORY.

BY way of Preface to a Manual on the Thirty-nine Articles, it may be well to say something of the men who framed them and of their times. The sixteenth century was an age of controversy all over Europe. For many previous centuries the Clergy and devout laity had only known the Holy Scriptures at second-hand. The knowledge of the original languages in which the inspired Books were written had been almost lost; the Bible was only known in the Latin or Vulgate version, and even of this many of the Clergy only knew such extracts as their books of devotion happened to contain. This being so, we can hardly be surprised that the great scholars who, towards the close of the fifteenth century, revived the study of Greek, and re-opened the fountains of theology, discovered that the Church, both in doctrine and in practice, had wandered far away from the lines laid down by the Apostles and early Fathers.

It was with some shock to their inherited notions that men then learned that the worship of the blessed Virgin, which had come to occupy so large a space in their churches and in their ritual, had no authority whatever in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the early Fathers.

It was with no less shock that they discovered how

utterly unlike to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as instituted in the upper chamber, and described by St. Paul and Justin Martyr, was the "Sacrifice of the Mass," as performed daily by the priests.

It was with yet greater shock perhaps, as penetrating more deeply into the hopes and fears of individual Christians, that they found how opposed to the whole doctrine of man's justification was the elaborate system of penances and pardons on which the Church's discipline had come to be built up.

Lastly, it was with little or no shock, here in England, that men's belief in the Pope's pretensions was shaken; for against them the English Church had been always more or less protesting.

But whatever the shock, "the new learning" was abroad, and spreading irresistibly. Colet was lecturing at Oxford on St. Paul's Epistles, and his lecture-room was crowded; Latimer was preaching, as few but Latimer could preach, in St. Edward's Church at Cambridge; Erasmus, in his turret chamber at Queen's College, Cambridge, was preparing the first critical edition of the Greek Testament, while his witty pen, in the intervals of severer labour, was pouring ridicule on the dogmatic systems of the Schoolmen; better still, the newly-invented printing-press was rapidly multiplying Tindal and Coverdale's versions of the Bible in the people's own language.

But error of long standing cannot be uprooted without some loosening of the foundations of truth. And so it was in the sixteenth century. The master minds, which had drunk so deeply at the fountains of inspiration, and were so profoundly imbued with the learning of the Fathers of the Church, saw with dismay that

the popular mind, in its recoil from superstition, was drifting away into fanaticism.

The fanatical errors which the Reformation developed, and from which the Church in England suffered so grievously in the following century, were mainly fourfold.

There were the *Predestinarians*, who maintained that "the elect" could not sin, nor fall from grace; teaching also the horrible doctrine that a certain portion of mankind were doomed from all eternity to perdition.

There were the *Antinomians*, who believed that those who were "in a state of grace" were in no need of laws of any kind; and that, however much they might sin in their outward man, in their inner man they sinned not.

There were *Anabaptists*, who, besides their error about baptism, acknowledged no judge or magistrate, and denied the lawfulness of property, or of war, or of capital punishment.

There were the *Puritans*, refusing to acknowledge any rules of Church Government that could not be found laid down in the text of Holy Scripture.

Others, who were too sensible to fall into fanaticisms of this kind, began to exaggerate the trustworthiness of private judgment, and to undervalue the Church's authority in matters of faith. Hence arose grievous errors:—some denying that the Sacraments were means of grace; others disbelieving the Divinity of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity, and limiting the benefits of Christ's coming to the knowledge He gave mankind of the true God.

Such were some of the evils inseparable from the crisis through which the English Church was passing. Those whom God's Providence called to the helm in

those troublous times, had to steer the ark of our English Church betwixt these opposite dangers. And they were men well fitted by their learning and moderation for the task.

"Cranmer had been a hard student,[1] and in the subjects of his study had kept pace with the times in which he lived. He began, where most scholars in those days ended, with Duns Scotus and the subtle doctors, a discipline which had at least the merit of making astute disputants; and as Bishop Berkeley said of academical learning in general, might serve even when forgotten, like a crop when ploughed under, to improve and enrich the soil. Escaped from the schools, he betook himself to the writings of Erasmus, for whom he seems to have entertained a strong personal regard, perhaps as being the author who first opened his eyes. Luther absorbed him in his turn; and now the controversy between that reformer and his opponents being serious, agitating matters no less than the fundamentals of the Christian faith, the appeal moreover being made to Scripture rightly interpreted, Cranmer set himself resolutely to the examination of the Word of God, that he might qualify himself for exercising a sound judgment on these high arguments; and of the patience, the learning, the discrimination, with which he did this, the Liturgy of our Church (were there no other) would be an everlasting monument."[2]

Cranmer's constant friend and counsellor in all his labours was Nicholas Ridley, whose profound knowledge, not only of Scripture, but of patristic theology,

[1] At Jesus College, Cambridge.
[2] Professor Blunt's *Sketch of the Reformation.*

made his assistance invaluable to the Archbishop. Professor Blunt gives a charming sketch of this holy man.

"Ridley was well born, coming of good stock in Northumberland; his reputation was great in Cambridge, where he was first a student and then the Master of Pembroke College. Henry promoted him to the See of Rochester; and Edward translated him to that of London. He was a man of vast reading, ready memory, wise of counsel, deep of wit, and very politic in all his proceedings. Though abundantly kind to his kinsfolk, he declared, even to his brother and sister, that doing evil they should look for nothing at his hand; such was his integrity: and when the mother of Bonner was his near neighbour at Fulham, he gave her a welcome to his table (an attention which was afterwards but ill returned by her son), assigning to her a chair of her own; so that even when the king's council dined with him, he did not suffer her to be removed, saying, 'By your Lordships' favour this place, by right of custom, is for my mother Bonner;' such was his tenderness. His life, which is probably a picture of that of the higher ecclesiastics of his time, was conducted with great regularity. Every morning, as soon as he had put on his clothes, he prayed in his chamber for half an hour; thence to business or to study till ten; after which he assembled his household for family prayers; dinner came next, which, with chess, engaged him for an hour; when, if there were no suitors, or matters to be transacted abroad, he returned to his study till five; evening prayers followed, then supper and his favourite chess; again his books till eleven o'clock, and so, his private devotions performed as in the morning, he ended his peaceful day."

The publications by which Cranmer and Ridley endeavoured to reinvigorate the faith of the English Church were mainly the following :—

Erasmus's *Paraphrase* of the New Testament, a copy of which, as well as of the Bible, was ordered to be set up in every parish church.

A volume of *Homilies*, twelve in number, of which those on "salvation" and on "faith and good works" were probably written by Cranmer himself; others, more strongly flavoured with controversy, by his chaplain Becon and the homely pen of Latimer (now Bishop of Worcester). Soon after this first Book of Homilies, there appeared (in 1548) *Cranmer's Catechism*, a translation of a Catechism of Luther's friend Justus Jonas ; soon followed by the far more excellent Catechism, which was of genuine English growth, and which we still retain (with Bishop Overall's addition on the Sacraments) in our Prayer Book. This latter Catechism seems to have been the work of Nowell[1] or Poinet,[2] revised by Cranmer and Ridley. It was called in those days *Edward the Sixth's Catechism.* Then came, also in 1548, the *Office of the Communion*, carefully and reverently compiled from the Roman Missal. This, the most essential part of our divine Service, was followed in the following year by other offices, making up what is called *The First Prayer Book of Edward VI.* (1549). The chief compilers were Cranmer, Ridley, and Goodrich, Bishop of Ely. Their object seems to have been to restore as far as possible the Liturgy of the Primitive Church, cutting out of the Breviary all that was unscriptural. Melanchthon and

[1] Colet's successor in the Deanery of St. Paul's.
[2] Afterwards Bishop of Winchester.

Bucer (the most learned of the Continental Reformers, —the latter Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge) had drawn up a very similar Liturgy for Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne; and from this some passages in our Prayer Book are borrowed, but the greater part is translated from the Liturgies of the fifth and sixth centuries, which Augustine brought with him into England in 597.

In 1552 the English Liturgy was republished, with some alterations made under the influence of the followers of Calvin, with whom Cranmer and Ridley had little sympathy. This was called the *Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth.*

In the same year (1552) appeared Cranmer's *Forty-two Articles.* It seems to have been the earnest wish of the wisest and best of the Reformers,—Melanchthon, Bucer, Cranmer and Ridley,—that the Church's Scriptural Faith should be embodied in a series of Articles which all the Reformed Churches should adopt. This appeared to be the more needful, because the Divines of the Church of Rome were occupied in drawing up a series of Articles at their Council of Trent, embodying, and actually incorporating with the Nicene Creed, all that was most unscriptural in their mediæval theology. In opposition to this Creed of Pope Pius IV., as it came to be called, the Lutheran Reformers framed their Confessions of Augsburg and Wirtemburg, which they hoped the English Church would adopt. But there were points on which the more Catholic Church of England differed from the Lutherans; and the English Divines preferred to draw up Articles of their own.

Cranmer's first draft was submitted to Sir William

Cecil (Secretary of State) and Sir John Cheke (the King's tutor), and after careful revision by the Bishops, was published by royal authority, to be subscribed by all the Clergy. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign a further revision of the Articles was made by the Convocation of the Clergy under Archbishop Parker. Seven Articles were cancelled: those, namely, On Grace, On Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, On the Obligation of the Moral Law, Against Millenarians, That the Resurrection is not past, That the Soul does not sleep, That all Men are not saved.

Four new Articles were added, namely, V. On the Holy Ghost; XII. On Good Works; XXIX. Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ; XXX. On Communion in both kinds.

Thus the number was reduced to thirty-nine. They were signed in Latin by the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, and ratified by the Queen in 1562; in 1571 an English translation was made under Jewel's editorship, was signed by both Houses of Convocation, and again ratified by the Crown; and by an Act of Parliament in the same year all the Clergy were required to subscribe them.

When we examine this form of faith, so scriptural and so entirely in accord with the mind of the primitive Church, and reflect on the troublous times in which it was drawn up, we may well thank God for the wisdom and moderation of the men who had the courage to lay down so broadly and so simply the lines of doctrine on which they invited the nation to take its stand.

It need hardly be said how deeply the writer of this Manual is indebted to Bishop Harold Browne's invaluable work.

LESSON II.

OF THE THREE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD.

ARTICLE I.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

THERE is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible.

And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Notes.—"**Without body, parts, or passions:**" —or, as the Latin may be rendered literally, "incorporeal, indivisible, incapable of suffering."

"**Person**" and "**substance**" differ in meaning: —A *person* is an individual moral agent to whom the words I, Thou, He, may be applied; *substance*, as here used, is the nature or essence whereof one or more persons subsist.

This Article sums up the teaching of Scripture about the Being of God:—

That He is One:—"Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord" (Mark xii. 29).

That He is a Spirit:—"God is a Spirit," or rather "God is Spirit" (John iv. 24); and again, "Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape" (v. 37). Therefore, whenever in the Old or New Testament we read of God appearing or speaking audibly to man, we must understand the Second Person of the Godhead placing Himself within the limitations of our world of sense, in order to make some revelation to man.

That God is the Creator and Preserver of the world of nature, and of the world of spirit:—"By Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible" (Col. i. 16).

That God has a threefold Personality:—"Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all" (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

More shortly, this Article declares to us the UNITY and the PERSONALITY of God.

The errors which it condemns are:—

(1) The *Polytheism* of heathen nations, who, denying God's Unity, are without our sure confidence that right and good *must* ultimately prevail over wrong and evil, and that all things are so ordered as to work together for good; for were there more than one Divine Will, the issue must needs be doubtful.

(2) The *Deism* of a mere natural theology, which, conceding that a "first Cause" is necessary, and finding evidence of intelligent design in nature, falls short of any sure belief in God's Personality. A divine mind, with no divine heart (for justification of

this word see Isa. lxiii.), is no such *Person* as a man can love or have recourse to trustfully in prayer.

(3) The *Pantheism* of modern dreamers, who confuse God and Nature, and utterly lose the idea of God's Personality. Their only idea of God is that universal spirit and life which they find pervading nature, manifesting itself in nature's incessant activities. Thus, God and Nature being the same, all that is *natural* is right; and the scriptural idea of the guilt of sin is explained away, what we call sin being merely natural imperfection.

From such bewildering errors we turn with thankfulness to the clear teaching of Holy Scripture, summed up in this Article :—That there is One Supreme God of a threefold Personality; that therefore we may love and adore our Heavenly Father, we may love and adore His Son our Redeemer, we may love and adore His Holy Spirit our Sanctifier, without losing our faith in God's Unity, inasmuch as these three distinct Persons are of one and the selfsame substance or essence.

ARTICLE II.

Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very Man.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and

Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

Notes.—**The Word,** the Son of God, is so called in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, because as a *word* expresses *thought*, so the Son declares or reveals the mind of the Father: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, Which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (i. 18).

Begotten. This word is used to express, not an event occurring at any particular time, but only the *relationship* of Son to Father, a relationship which (we are told) has subsisted between them "from everlasting."

Of one substance: of one and the selfsame essence, so that Father and Son are indivisibly united.

Took. This is an important word: the Divine Nature did not become human, but took to itself human nature from the blessed Virgin's substance.

Never to be divided. This again is most important: the Son did not lay aside the human nature which He had assumed when He returned to Heaven; but retains both natures distinct, yet inseparable, to all eternity.

Very God and very Man. "Very," as in the Nicene Creed, is an adjective meaning true or genuine.

This Article declares three doctrines:—

(1) The doctrine of the Divine Nature of the Son of God which He had before His Incarnation:—That He

shared His Father's glory from all eternity, "the glory that I had with Thee before the world was" (John xvii. 5). "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world" (ver. 24); indeed, a plurality of Persons is implied in the phrase "God is love" (1 John iv. 8); it implies some one to love and be loved by, from all eternity. And that He is of the same essence as God, "the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John i. 1); "Christ, Who is over all, God, Blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 5); "Our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. i. 1).

(2) The doctrine of the Human Nature of Soul and Body which the Son of God took at His Incarnation, and will retain for ever. This Human Soul was not superseded by the Divine Spirit, as the Apollinarians said, nor altogether deified, as the Eutychians imagined; but is retained in all its distinctness and perfection: He abideth "a Priest for ever," Who can be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" (Heb. vii. 17, iv. 15). Nor is it true that the Divine Nature merely entered into the human nature, as the *Nestorians* taught, as though a mere man had been born of Mary, the Second Person of the Trinity entering into the Man Jesus after His birth; for then Christ would have been in fact *two Persons*, one dwelling within the other. To preclude any such erroneous teaching, our Creed is careful to tell us that the Son of God was "conceived of the Virgin Mary"—the two Natures being combined from the moment of conception. "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i. 20). "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 35). "The Word was made

flesh" (John i. 14). That he had a *human soul* is shown by His "increasing in wisdom" (Luke ii. 52); being humanly ignorant of some things (Mark xiii. 32), and liable to temptation (Matt. iv. 1; Heb. iv. 15); from His feeling sorrow and sympathy (Luke xix. 41; John xi. 35); from the separation of His soul and body at death, the Divine Nature remaining conjoined to each.

(3) The doctrine of Christ's propitiatory sufferings. Although the Divine Nature is incapable of suffering (see Art. I.), yet in His human nature He "truly suffered;" and that the purpose of this suffering was to "reconcile His Father to us." Some may regret that the Scripture form of the phrase is not used, "reconcile us to His Father" (Eph. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 19); but in fact they are one and the same phrase in meaning: whereas there was enmity, there is now peace between God and man; sin had been the separation; by Christ's death the sin was taken out of the way. His sacrifice had this efficacy: "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed" (Isa. liii. 5, and 1 Pet. ii. 24). "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2). "He hath made Him to be sin[1] for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. v. 21). So St. Cyprian: "Christ the Mediator between two, puts on man, that He may bring man to the Father. Christ would be what man is, that man might be what Christ is" (*de Idol. Van.*).

[1] The word is probably used in the sense of sin-offering, as in Heb. ix. 28. In Lev. vi. 18 and many other places it is so translated.

The error condemned in this Article is that of *Socinianism* or *Unitarianism*, which denies the Godhead of Christ, and the propitiatory benefits of His death.

ARTICLE III.

Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

As Christ died for us and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that He went down into Hell.

Note.—The word **Hell** has unfortunately two meanings in English, being used as a translation of the Greek word for the Place of Torment ("Gehenna"), and used also as a translation of another Greek word which means the Unseen World ("Hades"). In this Article, as in the Creed, it means of course "Hades," the unseen world.

That Christ's human Soul went into that unseen resting-place to which the souls of all men pass when separated from the body, is plain from His words to the thief upon the Cross, and seems to be implied also from St. Peter's application to His Resurrection of David's words, "Thou wilt not leave My Soul in Hell" (Ps. xvi. 8, and Acts ii. 27).

In Cranmer's first draft of the Articles, this Article went on to assert that in the interval between Christ's Death and Resurrection His Spirit went and preached to the spirits in prison, on the authority of St. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 20). But this quotation was wisely expunged by Convocation in 1562; probably because of the doubtfulness whether such was the real meaning of the very difficult passage in St. Peter. Pearson (on the Creed), and many other of our ablest divines, under-

stand St. Peter to mean that the Spirit of Christ (compare 1 Pet. i. 11) preached by the mouth of Noah to the men of that generation, whose spirits were at the time when St. Peter was writing "in prison," because they listened not to that preaching.[1]

That Christ's soul during this interval did not return to His Father in Heaven seems to be implied by our Lord's own words to the Magdalen, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father" (John xx. 17). And that there is some such intermediate resting-place as is implied in the word "Hades,"—or rather resting-*state*, for the word *place* cannot properly be applied to the disembodied spirit,—seems to be clear from the Parable of Dives and Lazarus, and also from comparing together the scriptures which affirm that the soul continues to live after separation from the body (Rev. vi. 9; Luke xxiii. 43; Acts vii. 59; Matt. x. 28; Heb. xii. 23), with other scriptures which declare no less plainly that we are not to receive our reward or admission into Heaven until the Day of Judgment (Luke xiv. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14, v. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4).

That in this intermediate state the souls of the blessed are "with Christ" is (thanks be to God for the revelation!) clear from St. Paul's words, "to depart and be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23); and again, "While we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord," "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 6-8); as well as from our Lord's words to the thief, and St. Stephen's dying

[1] See Leighton on St. Peter, and Hammond, both of whom take Pearson's view. St. Augustine also inclines to it. For the opposite view see Bp. Horsley's famous sermon on the text.

prayer, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Into this intermediate resting-place, whatever it be, Christ's Soul passed at the moment of its separation from the Body. It is of deep comfort to know that He thus shared completely the lot of man, and sanctified by His gracious presence the whole of that dark valley.

ARTICLE IV.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all Men at the last day.

Notes.—**From death**: meaning His Body from the grave, and His soul from that intermediate resting-place called Paradise, or "Hell," that is, *Hades*. His Divine Nature had never quitted either soul or body; therefore it was that the Body had "seen no corruption."

With flesh, bones, etc. That the selfsame Body that was buried was raised is clear, for Scripture is most careful to assure us that the grave was seen to be empty. Moreover, when the disciples thought Him a Spirit, Christ replied, "Behold My hands and feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have" (Luke xxiv. 39). And in the very moment of His Ascension we read that He was lifting up *His hands* in attitude of blessing (ver. 50). But that our Lord's Body, though identically the same as that in which He had

suffered—retaining the very nail-prints and spear-wound (John xx. 25)—was in some measure spiritualized, seems clear from the mysterious way in which He appeared in the midst of them in the upper chamber when all the doors were shut (John xx. 19-26); and that after the Ascension it was glorified is plain from very many Scriptures. St. Paul, when speaking of *our* resurrection body as a "spiritual body," evidently intends us to understand that such also was Christ's resurrection body, for he speaks of our "bearing the image of the heavenly" body of our Lord (1 Cor. xv. 49). And so again, he speaks of Christ changing "our vile body, that it may be made like unto His glorious Body" (Phil. iii. 21).

ARTICLE V.

Of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

Notes.—Three truths are here asserted, the *Divinity*, *Personality* and *Procession* of the Holy Ghost.

Very and eternal God. This is a distinct assertion of His Divinity. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16). St. Paul here declares that the fact of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us makes us the *temple of God:* and so St. Peter speaks of "lying to the Holy Ghost" and "lying unto God," as convertible terms (Acts v. 3, 4). Our Lord's fearful denunciation

of the sin of blaspheming the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 32) necessarily implies His Divinity. But some, admitting His Divinity, denied His *Personality;* thinking that by the word Spirit was meant an energy, power or influence of God acting on the heart of man. Against this heresy the early Fathers showed that, in the baptismal formula given by Christ to His Apostles, the Holy Spirit is ranged co-ordinately with the First and Second Persons of the Trinity in a way that clearly implies that He is a Third Person. Moreover, our Lord (in John xiv. 26) calls Him a Paraclete (or Advocate or Comforter), Who should take His place, and be to His disciples what He had been, speaking of Him as "another Comforter" (ver. 16), and applying to Him the personal pronoun "*He*,"—"when He is come," "He shall teach you," "He shall testify," "He shall lead you." So St. Paul speaks of Him as interceding with the Father (Rom. viii. 26), and being grieved (Eph. iv. 30).

The Council of Constantinople (381), in order to define His nature, asserted that He was of the same *substance* or *essence* as the Father and the Son, to be worshipped no less than they; and, in order to distinguish Him as an individual Person, the Fathers of that Council selected, from among His attributes mentioned in Scripture, the attribute of *procession* (John xv. 26) as specially characteristic of the Spirit. The Creed of Nicæa had ended with the words "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The Council of Constantinople added, "The Lord and the Lifegiver, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets." The words "Who proceedeth

from the Father," were simply adopted from our Lord's words in John xv. 26. A controversy afterwards arose between the Eastern and Western Church, whether the Holy Ghost could be said to proceed from the Son as well as from the Father. The Western or Latin Church said Yes, because Christ said in that same verse "Whom I will send;" and because He is called "the Spirit of Christ" (1 Pet. i. 11); and went so far as to add the word *Filioque* (and from the Son) to their copies of the Creed. The Greek Church said this was heresy, both because it was done without the authority of a General Council, and because *mission* did not involve *procession*. The controversy was carried on with strange pertinacity and vehemence, and ended very sadly in a schism between the two Churches (eleventh century) which has never been healed.

The importance of the doctrine of the Procession lies in this, that it distinguishes His Personality from that of the Son, Who is "generated." Thus, by the Creed of Constantinople, the doctrine of the Trinity was completed.

All the Three Persons are of one and the same Divine Essence or Substance, but each has His special characteristic.

The Divine Essence with the attribute of *self-existence* is our idea of the First Person;

The Divine Essence with the attribute of *Sonship* or *generation* is our idea of the Second Person;

The Divine Essence with the attribute of *Procession* is our idea of the Third Person.

LESSON III.

OF THE BIBLE AND THE CREEDS.

ARTICLE VI.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Then follow the Names and Number of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.

And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.

Then follow the names of the fourteen uncanonical Books:—

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them for Canonical.

Notes.—**Necessary to salvation**:—necessary to enable us to fulfil our part in the Christian Covenant.

Canonical. The word Canon signifies a rule or standard by which other things are to be measured or judged. Hence Canonical, as applied to Books, means authoritative as a standard of Divine truth.

Hierome, the old English form of Hieronymus, more commonly called Jerome. He was born at Stridon in Dalmatia, about A.D. 331, some say 341, certainly some years before Chrysostom and Augustine. He was educated and converted to Christianity at Rome, and became the intimate friend and adviser of Pope Damasus. Being of a severe ascetic turn of mind, he withdrew from the society of men and lived as a monk at Bethlehem, employing himself in learning Hebrew and re-translating the Scriptures into Latin. This attempt to supersede the old imperfect Latin version of the Septuagint by a fresh version from the original Hebrew, was denounced by many as impious; but Jerome's version came gradually to be adopted by the Church, and is the foundation of the *Vulgate*,—the Latin Bible approved by the Roman Church;—only with this important difference, that whereas St. Jerome carefully distinguished the *uncanonical* from the *canonical* Scriptures, the Council of Trent abolished the distinction. The English Church (as is seen in this Article) adheres to the judgment of St. Jerome.

Two things are insisted on in this Article:—

(1) The sufficiency of Scripture without tradition;

(2) the difference between the canonical and uncanonical Scriptures.

I. Six years before the first publication of these Articles (in 1546) the Council of Trent had decreed that Holy Scripture does *not* contain all that is necessary for faith and morals, but that there is also need of an unwritten traditional doctrine, which the Church is bound to regard with the same piety and reverence with which she receives the Holy Scriptures. The Church of England framed this Article to repudiate such a doctrine.

It is perfectly true that Christ said He had many things to say to His Apostles which they could not then bear (John xvi. 12), and that after His resurrection He spake many things pertaining to the Kingdom of God which are not recorded in Holy Scripture (Acts i. 3), and that St. Paul told his converts to hold fast the *traditions* which they had been taught, whether by word of mouth or by epistle (2 Thess. ii. 15). But we have indications that the Apostles, mistrusting such unwritten tradition, of set purpose committed to writing ere they died all that they deemed essential. St. Peter pleads as his reason for writing his Second Epistle his anxiety that they should be able, after his decease, to have these things always in remembrance (2 Pet. i. 15). St. John concludes his Gospel with the words, "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His Name" (John xx. 31). He confessed that there were many other things which Jesus did which he had not recorded (xxi. 25), but he clearly considered that what he had *written* was sufficient for belief that Jesus is the Christ, the

Son of God, and for "life through His Name;"—the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation" could hardly be better expressed. St. Luke confesses that many accounts of our Lord's ministry were current, but he desired to commit an authentic one to writing, that Theophilus might "know the *certainty* of those things wherein he had been catechetically instructed" (Luke i. 1-4). He could not have stated more clearly our Church's opinion that written records are better than oral tradition. The value of a *written* Bible to the Jews is frequently insisted on: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39); "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures" (Matt. xxii. 29); the chief advantage of the Jews was that to them were committed the oracles of God (Rom. iii. 1, 2); the Holy Scriptures are spoken of as able to make a man wise unto salvation, and again, as given by inspiration of God, that the man of God may be perfect, *thoroughly furnished* unto all good works (2 Tim. iii. 15-17). *Tradition*, on the other hand, is spoken of more than once as liable to mislead:—"Why do ye transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" "In vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. xv. 3, 9), "making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition" (Mark vii. 13).

No doubt a saying of Christ or of His Apostles handed down by oral tradition, if we could be assured that it was correctly handed down, would be as valuable as a written saying. But we have no such assurance, and can have none. Whereas, in the Vatican or Sinaitic Manuscript, we have a security that the New

Testament which we are now reading was word for word the same as the New Testament which the Christians of the fifth century were reading. Any tampering with the text, if such there were, would be immediately revealed by the microscope. When we appeal to what is written in a book accessible to all, we know what we are about. Whereas, if we refer men to an oral tradition, they ask us where they are to find it, and we have no definite reply. "In the writings of the Fathers" would be a bewildering answer to most; "in the living voice of the Church" would be still less definite. Whereas, even in those early centuries, when tradition might be thought a far more trustworthy guide than now, the Christian Churches seem to have agreed with one consent in all their Councils to bring all matters of faith and morals to the test of God's Word written.

Athanasius, in the fourth century, begins his discourse against the Gentiles by laying down this broad principle: "The holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient in themselves for the declaration of the truth;" again, in his 39th Festal Epistle, he writes: "These" (the Books of the Old and New Testament, which he has been enumerating) "are the fountains of salvation; so that he who is athirst may be satiated with the oracles therein contained. In this alone is the doctrine of our religion set forth. Let no one add thereto or take therefrom." Then he goes on to distinguish the *uncanonical* books as of lower value, though profitable for instruction—just as St. Jerome does in the pasages above quoted.

Thus it clearly appears that our English Church is abundantly warranted in asserting that all that is

necessary for salvation may be found in Holy Scripture, without any addition thereto from tradition. The great value of *tradition*, as we proceed to show, is in determining what is Scripture.

II. We now come to the second point insisted on in this Article : that our Church receives certain specified Books as *canonical*, that is, inspired and authoritative in matters of doctrine. And here we find at once a most interesting illustration of that principle of the *appeal to antiquity* which, as we have seen, our Church recognises.

On what grounds does our Church venture to make this distinction between *canonical* and *uncanonical* Books? On the ground that certain Books of both Old and New Testament have our Lord's sanction, and others have not. And how can it be ascertained what books have, and what books have not, this sanction? By an appeal to antiquity.

This needs further explanation. And *first*, What do we mean by saying that certain Books of the Old and New Testament have our Lord's sanction?

We mean this, that we find our Lord and His Apostles very evidently accepting a certain number of Books called "the Scriptures," or called otherwise by a threefold designation, "The Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets," as of divine authority. So much for the *Old* Testament. And, for the *New* Testament, we find our Lord no less distinctly giving His sanction and authority to a certain group of men called Apostles to record His own ministry and doctrine for the instruction of His Church.

It may suffice to indicate very briefly that this is so.

First,—for the *Old* Testament, we find that Christ and His Apostles were accustomed to refer to certain received scriptures already written as of divine authority :—

"Beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concernig Me" (Luke xxiv. 27, 44).

"They have Moses and the Prophets ; let them hear them" (Luke xvi. 29).

"Search the Scriptures ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life ; and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39).

"The Scriptures must be fulfilled" (Mark xiv. 49).

St. Paul calls them "The oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2) ; and speaks of "the Holy Scriptures" as "able to make" Timothy "wise unto salvation;" for "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16).

Thus clearly is a certain collection of *Old* Testament Scriptures recognised by our Lord and His Apostles as of divine authority.

And how for the authority of what the Apostles wrote, *i.e.* of the *New* Testament. *Inspiration* for this purpose is clearly *promised* to them *and claimed by them :* "The Comforter Which is the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "He will guide you into all truth, and show you things to come" (John

xiv. 25, xvi. 13). "It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (Mark xiii. 11). Accordingly the Apostles claim that the deep things of God are revealed to them by His Spirit; that they speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth (1 Cor. ii. 10, 13); that the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, was now revealed to the Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit (Eph. iii. 4, 5).

So much for the Divine sanction being accorded to a certain collection of Old Testament Scriptures which were already written, and to a certain collection of New Testament Scriptures which were to be written.

But how do we know that the collection of Scriptures, Old and New, which we now authorize, is identically the same as the collection, Old and New, thus stamped with Divine authority? This brings us to the appeal to antiquity and tradition.

First, as regards the Old Testament:—Was the collection to which our Lord referred the same as the collection given in our English Bible?

The collection, as given in our English Bible, is the collection given by St. Jerome, and *not* the collection authorized by the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397).

The Church of Carthage preferred to receive *all* the Books found in the Greek Bible of the Septuagint, in number about twenty-eight, what we call the Apocryphal[1] books being included. But Jerome said they were wrong, and that the Hebrew Canon only contained twenty-two Books, excluding the Apocrypha.

St. Jerome gives us his list of twenty-two, and it

[1] How these later Greek books of the Jews came to be called by the name Apocrypha is not clear.

agrees with ours,—Judges and Ruth are reckoned as one book; so are the two Books of Samuel, the two of Kings, the two of Chronicles; so also are Ezra and Nehemiah; Jeremiah's Prophecies and Lamentations; and the Minor Prophets. Thus our thirty-nine are in his list reduced to twenty-two,—the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

The question then arises, Which was right, the provincial Council of Carthage, whose list (including the Apocrypha) was adopted by the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent,—or St. Jerome, whose list, excluding the Apocrypha, is adopted by the English Church?

We think we have good reason to believe that St. Jerome's list was the list adopted by the Jews at the time of our Lord's ministry. And our reason is this. We can trace St. Jerome's list—nearly always divided into Law, Psalms, and Prophets—backwards up to the time of the Apostles. Ruffinus gives it in the year 398, Gregory of Nazianzum gives it, 376, so does the Council of Laodicea, 364, so do Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary of Poictiers, Athanasius, 340-360; Melito[1] (160) went to Palestine on purpose to ascertain what books were reckoned as canonical by the Jews, and gives the same list as Jerome. Josephus, who was born only a few years after the Crucifixion, though he gives no list, speaks of the Books being in number twenty-two (Jerome's number) and in three classes, the Law, the Prophets, and Hagiographa. Philo, contemporary with the Apostles, gives the same threefold classification, and, as we have seen from the 24th chapter of St. Luke, our Lord spoke of the Scriptures under the very same threefold classification also. One more

[1] Euseb., *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 26.

conclusive reason may be given :—We have the Targums or Jewish Paraphrases, written about the time of the Apostles or before, of all the Books of our Old Testament, Targums of the Law, Targums of the Prophets, Targums of the Chebuthim or Hagiographa, —but *none of the Apocrypha.* And, lastly, our Lord and His Apostles make 283 quotations from the Old Testament, and not one of these is from the Apocrypha. Whereas, of the Books which we hold to be canonical there are only six which are not quoted.[1] On this evidence, our Church asserts with some confidence that the Old Testament as we have it was the Old Testament sanctioned by our Lord and His Apostles, exclusive of the Apocrypha.

As regards the Canon of the *New Testament* there is no difference between the Anglican and any other branch of the Catholic Church. But the reasons for which we hold these twenty-seven Books to be canonical are not quite the same as those assigned by the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome receives them on the simple authority of a decree of a Council,[2] believing that the Church is not only "a witness and a keeper,"[3] but also an infallible *judge* of Holy Writ.

The English Church believes these twenty-seven Books to have Divine authority—

First, because it is abundantly evident, from the New Testament itself, that a certain group of Apostolic men had a special gift of inspiration ; and,

Secondly, because the concurrent testimony of the

[1] Judges, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, are not quoted in the N. T.

[2] The Council of African Bishops at Carthage, A.D. 397, at which St. Augustine was present.

[3] Art. XX.

early Church proves that these twenty-seven Books were written by that group of Apostolic men.

Thus our confidence in their Divine authority rests partly on internal evidence and partly on tradition. Thus our appeal is not to the *sanction*, but rather to the *witness* of the Church. If we have sufficient witness that the Books are genuine,—written, as they profess to be, by Apostolical men,—then we have Christ's own sanction for their Divine authority. It is quite unnecessary here to give the early Church's testimony to the genuineness of these Books of the New Testament: it consists of four kinds:—

1. Manuscripts, as old as the fifth and even fourth centuries.
2. Versions in various languages, the Syriac being made as early as the second century.
3. Catalogues given by the writers already named on page 29 and others, the oldest being that of Papias (A.D. 140-150), and of the Muratorian fragment (A.D. 170?).
4. Quotations, which are so abundant in the writers of the second, third, fourth, and fifth centuries, that almost the whole of our New Testament might be compiled from them.

Such are the grounds on which the several Books of our Bible are received by the English Church as canonical, and distinguished from those which we hold to be uncanonical.

LESSON IV.

OF THE BIBLE AND THE CREEDS—*CONTINUED.*

ARTICLE VII.

Of the Old Testament.

THE Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian Men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

Notes.—The Article declares two things:—(1) That eternal life is offered to mankind *in the Old* as well as in the New Testament through Jesus Christ, and that the Fathers looked for a world to come: and (2) that

the *civil* and *ceremonial* part of the Mosaic Law is abrogated, while the *moral* part is still binding.

I. Some (like Bishop Warburton), noticing the absence of any appeal to future rewards or punishments in the Law of Moses, have argued that a knowledge of the world to come was withheld from God's ancient people. Those who draw this inference misunderstand the intention of the Law of Moses. It was not intended to give the people a *religion.* They had a religion already. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, makes this quite clear, saying that the Law was a something *superadded* to a previously existing religion (iii. 19). What was this previously existing religion? It was the Promise made to Abraham. And what was this Promise? It was the promise of a Seed in Whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed (iii. 17). Abraham and all the Patriarchs clearly looked forward to enjoying *in their own persons* the fulfilment of this future blessedness. Abraham rejoiced to think that he should see the Messiah's day (John viii. 56); he had so intense a faith that the covenant God had made with him was an *everlasting* covenant (Gen. xvii. 7), and that *death* could not frustrate it, that he hesitated not to slay his son, feeling sure death was not the end of life. So Jacob on the very point of death, amid all his dark forebodings about his sons, breaks forth into thankfulness that at last he was on the point of attaining *the salvation* which God had promised him ("I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord," Gen. xlix. 18). So (as our Lord pointed out to the Sadducees in Luke xx. 37), long after Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead, God continued to call Himself *their* God, showing that

they were still in covenant with Him,—living therefore in another world. If any doubt about the patriarchs' belief in a future state were left, the eleventh chapter of Hebrews would entirely remove it:—"These all died in faith, not having" (in this life) "received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. . . . They desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God" (our Lord's argument in Luke xx. 37). And that their hope of this everlasting life was based on Christ, that is, on the promised Messiah, is plain from the way in which they treasured the promise made to Abraham, renewed to David in Nathan's great prophecy (2 Sam. vii. 12-14), and reappearing continually in the Psalms and Prophets. The hope of this Messiah was the national hope. And although it would be too much to affirm that the people generally, before their return from Captivity, embraced the hope of a resurrection to life when their Messiah should appear, yet clearly holy men here and there among them, patriarchs or prophets ("the old Fathers" of this Article), were inspired with this belief; and in the time of the Maccabees it had become the popular creed.

We too, in the light of the New Testament, see and understand that in their whole sacrificial system they were (perhaps unconsciously) pleading the One great Sacrifice which in the fulness of time was to be accomplished. The language of this first part of the Article is, therefore, fully warranted by Scripture.

II. This second part of the Article is twofold.

(1) The *ceremonial* and *civil* laws were abolished by Christ's Gospel. St. Paul distinctly condemns those who wished to enforce the Jewish ceremonial on Gentile Christians (Gal. iv. 9, 10, v. 2); the Epistle to the Hebrews says plainly that the New Covenant *superseded* the Old Covenant, the old being "ready to vanish away" when the new came (viii. 13). That the *civil* polity of the Jews cannot be the model for modern nations is plain, for no modern nation is a theocracy: Christ's kingdom is not a kingdom of this world. The kingdoms of this world have their *human* governments; and a human governor would do wrong to enforce his authority in matters that lie between the soul and God, though a Divine Governor might. Hence modern governments are wisely content to legislate against *crime*, that is, *civil* or *social* offences, only; whereas the Law of Moses extended to all sins, whether against God or man, being administered by a Divine Governor.

(2) The moral part of the Mosaic Law is still in force, being based on those principles of justice and truth which are eternal. "The *righteousness* of the Law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" (Rom. viii. 4). So far from abrogating the moral commandments of God, Christ made them more stringent in His Sermon on the Mount. Speaking of this portion of the Law He said, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (that is, complete or perfect) "the Law" (Matt. v. 17).

This latter part of the Article is, therefore, as fully justified by Scripture as the former part.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Three Creeds.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

Notes.—**Nicene Creed.** So called, because it was drawn up, so far as the words "And I believe in the Holy Ghost," at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. The latter words, "The Lord and Giver of life," to the end, were added at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, —a Council summoned to condemn the *Macedonian* heretics, who denied the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

Athanasius's Creed. So called, because it sets forth the great doctrine of which St. Athanasius was the resolute defender. But the Creed was clearly drawn up not by a Greek, but by a Latin Father; nor can it well have been composed earlier than St. Augustine's time, as it repeats many of his phrases, and contains the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's Procession from the Son, which St. Augustine was the first to bring prominently forward. That it was drawn up, however, before the rise of the *Eutychian* heresy is evident. The Eutychians denied that Christ had two distinct Natures (human and divine): and, had the Creed been framed after their time, the doctrine of the two distinct Natures would have been more emphatically asserted;—certainly the 35th verse of the Creed ("For as the reasonable soul and flesh is

one man, so God and man is one Christ") would have been omitted. Of course, the verse means, "As soul and flesh make one *person* in a man, so God and man in Christ make one *Person;*" but obviously it might be construed to mean, "As soul and flesh make one *nature* in a man, so God and man make one *Nature* in Christ,"—which would be Eutychianism, merging the two natures into One. The most probable date of the Creed is therefore between A.D. 400 and 450.

There is a MS. of it as old as A.D. 600, and a Commentary on it of still older date (570).

The Apostles' Creed has been spoken of in former Manuals. This eighth Article, in accordance with the principle laid down in the sixth, rests our Church's acceptance of these Creeds on their being warranted by Scripture.

This point—the authority of the Church's Creeds—needs further enlargement, for it is often misunderstood. We do not claim for the Creeds that they are inspired documents. But we claim this for them:—that they stand in the same relation to the facts of Revelation, in which Kepler's Laws of Motion, or Newton's Principia, stand to the facts of nature. They have been arrived at by an inductive process of reasoning, as vigorous and scientific, as that by which the principles of mechanics or of astronomy have been arrived at.

The great scientific theologians of the third and fourth centuries were students of Revelation as conscientious and profound as the great natural philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Just as Bacon, Kepler, Descartes, Leibnitz, Newton, had before them facts of nature, classified those facts,

induced upon them certain general ideas, which seemed to explain them, and so by a process of careful verification, arrived at the laws of nature;—even so Athanasius, the two Gregories, Jerome, Augustine, and the other great theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries, had before them the facts of Revelation, carefully compared those facts, induced upon them certain general ideas which seemed to harmonize them, and so by a no less strictly inductive process, arrived at the doctrines of theology; and these doctrines of theology, which find expression in the Athanasian Creed for instance, have been continually verified by succeeding ages, and have been found to explain the facts of Revelation so perfectly and satisfactorily, that they have come to be accepted by the whole Church with a confidence as justifiable as that with which astronomers accept the principles of Newton.

The doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement are not to be found written down in express terms in the records of Revelation, any more than are the laws of motion or gravitation to be found imprinted on the face of nature; but they are no less certain, and have been arrived at by a process of inductive reasoning no less rigorously scientific.

This, and no less than this, is asserted in this Article, when it declares that the Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

LESSON V.

OF SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN.

ARTICLE IX.

Of Original or Birth-sin.

ORIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.

And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, *φρόνημα σαρκὸς*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that con-

cupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

Notes.—"**The Pelagians.**" In the beginning of the fifth century, before the death of Augustine, a British monk, called Pelagius (Morgan in Welsh?), residing at Rome, and afterwards in Palestine, was condemned at a Council at Carthage (A.D. 412) for explaining away original sin, saying that it only meant sinning after similitude of Adam's sin; and that, until they so sin, infants are in the same state in which Adam was before his fall.

"**Original Sin**" is here defined to be "the fault and corruption of the nature" of every descendant of Adam, naturally born into the world. The words "*naturally* ingendered" are carefully added to show that our Lord, though according to the flesh a descendant of Adam, was nevertheless free from this hereditary taint of sin, being *supernaturally* born into the world.

God's wrath and damnation. The word damnation here (as in Rom. iii. 8 and 1 Cor. xi. 29) means condemnation,—"deserves to be condemned by God."

Them that are regenerated. In the Latin, "born again," a phrase used by the Reformers as equivalent to *baptized.*

"**Yet the Apostle doth confess.**" The allusion seems to be to Rom. vii. 7, where the Apostle instances lust (or concupiscence) as an obvious *sin* which he would not have known but for the law: thus confessing that it had the nature of sin, although he begins the next chapter by asserting that "there is no condemnation for them which are in Christ Jesus."

This Article was written before the unprofitable controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians.

There is, therefore, no allusion in it to the Calvinistic notion of original sin, that it is the *imputation* of Adam's guilt to all his posterity.

To this scholastic idea of an imputation of Adam's guilt the Calvinists added the doctrine of a corruption of human nature so entire, that not a spark of natural goodness was left.

The view of original sin set forth in this Article is a far simpler one. It is, (1) That we all bring into the world a nature inclined to evil, and "very far removed" from the original righteousness of our first parents. (2) That this sinfulness of our nature deserves the wrath of God. (3) That the effect of Baptism is to remove God's condemnation, but not to remove the hereditary infection of nature.

The Article was doubtless directed mainly against the Anabaptists, who had lately revived the old Pelagian heresy, denying the corruption of human nature, and saying that children had no stain of sin until they began to imitate Adam's sin, and therefore no need of baptism till then.

The first draft of the Article in 1552 began thus: "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do now-a-days renew."

Socinians likewise deny the corruption of human nature, and (therefore) the necessity of Infant Baptism.

But that we do come into the world with a natural tendency to sin is the sad experience of every one who has really examined his own heart, or studied carefully that of children. The Psalmist was convinced of it, confessing that he was "shapen in iniquity, and in sin did his mother conceive him" (Psa. li. 5). God

declared that "the imagination of man's heart was evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21); our Lord no less clearly, "There is none good but One, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17); and that none could "enter the kingdom of God unless he were born again" (John iii. 3). St. Paul affirms that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii. 23), adding, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh" (meaning *my unregenerate self*), "dwelleth no good thing" (vii. 18).

That St. Paul did not mean merely that all are "under sin," because all have followed Adam's sinful example, is clear from what he says elsewhere, that (because of this sin) "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned *after the similitude of* Adam's transgression" (v. 14.)

This passage, showing thus clearly that he was not merely speaking of a following of Adam's example, shows also that he was not speaking of an imputed sinfulness; for he is speaking of the sin which reigned between Adam and Moses, when there was no law, and "sin" (he says) "is not imputed where there is no law."

What then is this universal sinfulness of which St. Paul is speaking (in this fifth chapter of Romans), if it be neither imputed, nor yet necessarily actual?

It is precisely what is meant by original sin in this Article,—that natural tendency to evil, displeasing to God, which we all inherit from Adam. The plain truth is (though neither the Socinian nor the Pantheist will allow it), we belong to a degenerate, fallen race, and are under God's displeasure, until He takes us back into His favour in Holy Baptism. Baptism restores us to His favour, and so gives us the grace to overcome, though it removes not, the hereditary tendency to evil.

ARTICLE X.

Of Free Will.

The condition of Man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

Notes.—**The condition of man.** A condition of slavery; for our Lord declares that whosoever committeth sin is the servant (or slave) of sin (John viii. 34), and St. Paul contrasts the bondage of our corrupt nature with the glorious freedom of the regenerate (Rom. viii. 21); saying in that same chapter (ver. 8) that "they that are in the flesh" (still in their unregenerate nature) "cannot please God."

"Without the grace of God." The Holy Spirit being the most excellent gift of God, and freely given, is by way of eminence called Grace.

Preventing—Co-operating. The Holy Spirit must come first to give us the will, and must continue to come in order to strengthen our effort; as St. Paul declares that "He worketh in us both to *will* and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 13). The force of the word *prevent*, is that the very first desire to turn to God must come from God. The force of the phrase "Co-operating with us"—working not merely *in us* (as the Calvinists wished to translate it), but *with us*—is,

that our better self, being revived by the preventing grace, is strengthened, not superseded, by the co-operating grace.

The question how far man's will is free has been much discussed in the Church. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and the Dominicans, the Calvinists and the Jansenists are on one side, disposed to ascribe all to grace: on the other side are, Pelagius, Duns Scotus and the Franciscans, the Arminians and the Jesuits, saying that man is perfectly free to turn to or from God. Our Article steers a middle course between the two extremes: and so does Holy Scripture, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 13).

ARTICLE XI.

Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

Notes.—**We are accounted righteous.** This phrase is clearly intended to be our Church's definition of Justification. This is important; the Council of Trent said that "to justify" meant not to account righteous, but to *make* righteous (by infusion of holi-

ness). That the corresponding Hebrew and Greek words are in the Bible used in the sense of *declaring righteous* as opposed to condemnation, seems clear from such passages as the following:—"He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination unto the Lord" (Prov. xvii. 15). "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (Matt. xii. 37). "Wisdom is justified of her children" (Luke vii. 35). "All the people justified God" (Luke vii. 29). He (Christ) "was justified in the spirit" (1 Tim. iii. 16). Thus, as applied to man, the word comes to mean that state of remission of sins into which we are baptized: for fallen man can only be declared righteous by a remission of sins. That St. Paul in his great argument also uses the word in this sense, seems clear from the following passage, where justification must be understood as equivalent to the "remission of sins:"—"Being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, His righteousness; that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24-26). Again, in Titus iii. 5-7, justification is clearly used to describe the state into which a man is baptized: "He saved us by the washing of regeneration; . . . that, being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs. . . ." In Rom. v. 18 and viii. 33, it is clearly opposed to condemnation: "By the offence of one (judgment came) upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of One (the free

gift came) upon all men unto justification of life." Here it cannot mean infused righteousness, for if so, condemnation must mean "infused sinfulness," which would be shocking, for both are spoken of as proceeding from God! Therefore the Church of England keeps the idea of justification quite distinct from that of sanctification, though the two go necessarily together.

Justified by faith only. If we are admitted into this state of justification at our Baptism, and if this be true as our Church teaches in the case of Infant Baptism, then what does our Church mean by the phrase "justified by faith only"? Clearly it means that for our justification, *i.e.* for the remission of our sins, *whether in Baptism or afterwards*, we must *trust* to God's mercy in Christ, and to that only, renouncing all idea of *merit* on our part. This is the teaching of the Homily "on the Salvation of all mankind," to which this Article refers us. Justification is a matter, not of *merit*, but of *faith*, *i.e.* we *trust to Christ* for it. And this faith or trust is not mere *belief* (*fides informis*), but rather a sense of trustfulness, carrying with it essentially the idea of loving dependence on God (*fides formata*). If St. Paul, when insisting on the doctrine of justification by faith in his Epistle to the Romans, meant the former kind of faith, then St. Paul and St. James are opposed in doctrine; but if St. Paul meant the latter ("faith working by love," Gal. v. 6, *living*, operative faith), then St. Paul and St. James are in no way contradictory, for St. James is clearly denying the sufficiency of faith in that other sense—mere belief,—consent of the mind, without any fruitfulness.

That St. Paul and St. James are really in perfect

agreement seems clear from the fact that both point to Abraham, as showing forth that virtue on which justification depends. "A living faith" is St. Paul's phrase; "faith made perfect by works" is St. James's phrase; clearly they both mean the same thing. And *this* is the meaning of faith in this Article.

The Article is intended to condemn all self-justifying claims. Justification is a state of pardon and acceptance, bestowed upon us freely for Christ's sake, by the mercy of God. It is given to us in Baptism. By faith—living, active faith, belief influencing conduct—we embrace it in after life; if we lose this faith we forfeit it; the fruits of faith, *i.e.* holiness of life, will be the criterion at the last day whether we have, or have not, forfeited the justification which Christ has obtained for us. As Bishop Harold Browne tersely puts it:—"The meritorious cause of our salvation is Christ's atonement; the instrument by which we are brought into covenant with God is baptism; the means whereby our state of acceptance is maintained is faith; but the criterion by which our final state may be determined will be works."

LESSON VI.

OF SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN—*CONTINUED.*

ARTICLE XII.

Of Good Works.

ALBEIT that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

Notes.—**Follow after justification.** The word "follow" is intended to be emphatic. St. Augustine and Luther denied that good works could precede justification. "Good works," Augustine taught, "follow upon justification, and do not precede in order to justification" (*De Fide et Operibus*, c. 14). This will appear in the next Article.

Cannot put away our sins. They are in no sense meritorious. "We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do" (Luke xvii. 10). "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (1 John i. 8).

Pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ: not meritorious in themselves, but nevertheless pleasing to God *in Christ.* Pleasing to God when offered through the mediation of our High Priest: we are to offer "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5). "Do *all* in the Name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. iii. 17). Again and again, in parable and precept, our Lord tells us that God will reward every man according to his works (Matt. xvi. 27); but is God bound to reward him by virtue of the merit of those works? No: "With Thee, O Lord, is *mercy*, for Thou rewardest every one according to his work" (Ps. lxii. 12). The works constitute no claim, although God of His mercy and free grace chooses to reward us according to them. It is entirely for Christ's sake. They are not rewarded *de condigno*, that is, because of their deserving it.

So far from faith without works being sufficient (as some fanatics taught), our Church teaches that the two are inseparable. Holiness of life is the only measure of faith. Where holiness is wanting, faith is wanting.

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Works before Justification.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded

them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

Notes.—**Works before Justification.** It will be observed that there is not a word about Justification in the Article itself. The Schoolmen, however, had been accustomed to the phrase "works before justification," and it was adopted therefore as the heading of this Article, although (as will be seen in the sequel) "works before grace," or "works without faith," would have more correctly expressed the subject of the Article.

Grace of congruity. This technical phrase needs explanation. The question often rose among the Schoolmen, How about efforts after goodness made by men who are not Christians? Are they pleasing to God and acceptable? They were unwilling to allow that they constituted a claim to reward, but equally unwilling to say they were unacceptable to God. They solved or rather evaded the difficulty, by saying, that good works done before grace was received, were rewarded of God's *liberality*, whereas good works done after grace was received, were rewarded of God's *justice*. They said that the former had a *merit of congruity*, making men *meet* to receive grace; the latter had a *merit of condignity*, giving men a *claim* upon God.

Luther seemed to see in this doctrine the very root of self-righteousness, the very evil which St. Paul indicated when he said, "Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith" (Rom. ix. 31). He saw that if he allowed this doctrine of *merit of congruity* before justification, and *merit of condignity* after justification, his doctrine

of justification by faith (*i.e.* by trusting to Christ only for it) would fall to the ground. He therefore used to denounce it almost passionately; maintaining that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. ix. 23), and that "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). To Luther's influence, no doubt, is due the very strong language with which this Article concludes, saying that "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit *have the nature of sin.*"

Did Luther mean, and does this Article mean, that all the efforts after goodness made by men not in covenant with God—such as Socrates, or the Roman centurion Cornelius—were displeasing to God, and had the nature of sin? Not for one moment; such a doctrine would be shocking and unscriptural. The case of Cornelius was objected to Luther; and he replied at once that he included him—Gentile though he was—among those who had faith. The passage in Hebrews quoted above shows that *Enoch* also must be included among those who had faith. For his translation proved that he pleased God, and "without faith it is impossible to please God;" therefore (it is argued) Enoch had faith. It was faith no doubt of the very simplest kind: a belief "that God is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." To all the righteous heathen of old days, and to all the righteous heathen of our own day, who have this elementary faith in God's existence, and who make efforts after goodness in order to please Him, we must clearly extend the terms of this Article.

Justin Martyr, and many of the ancient Fathers, attributed the goodness of such righteous heathen to the influence of the Holy Spirit on their hearts.

Fallen though men be, still there is a certain amount of Divine light in all,—"the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John i. 9), leading even the heathen to "seek the Lord, if haply they might find Him" (Acts xvii. 27);—to this Divine Light we must attribute all that is really good in mankind. "Good works" done from other motives, from pride of heart, self-righteousness, or love of praise, are displeasing to God, and have the nature of sin.

If this be the meaning of the Article, as we have good ground for supposing, when applied to the case of an unbaptized heathen, then clearly *for such application* the heading of the Article should rather be "Of works done without faith in God, and without the grace of God." For the phrase "before justification" would include too much, sweeping *all* the works of those who are not in covenant with God into the category of sin. The example of Cornelius clearly shows that God's grace may reach and influence men before they are "justified," in the sense given to the word in the eleventh Article, namely, taken into Covenant with God; and that their good works are really good, and acceptable to God.

The fact that the Editors of the Article chose to give it this heading proves that they had the case of *nominal* Christians mainly, if not exclusively, in view. If they choose to live outside the Covenant, then their works, however moral in the sight of the world, yet, being done from other than Christian motives, cannot be pleasing to God, and must have the nature of sin, springing from pride and self-righteousness.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary Works besides, over and above, God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but they do more for His sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We be unprofitable servants.

Notes.—**Works of supererogation:** *supererogare* is the word used in the Vulgate version of Luke x. 35, "Whatsoever thou spendest more." *Erogare* in Latin meant to vote money out of the treasury, hence generally "to spend," and *supererogare* to "spend more than is required." It came to be applied to *works of more than ordinary merit* in this way: The Fathers noticed that our Lord, speaking to the rich young man, seemed to make a distinction between *precepts* and *counsels*. The young man had kept all the precepts of the law, Christ goes on to give him counsels of perfection: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor" (Matt. xix. 21). So St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 25), "Concerning virgins, I have no *commandment* of the Lord; yet I give my *advice*." Thus the monks came to look upon vows of poverty, celibacy, and the like, as counsels of perfection, and called them "works of supererogation," as though they were spending more on God's

service than was required. The Roman Church regarded such works as a store of merits on which the Pope might draw; as though the Church had a balance to her credit in her account with God, and might out of that balance grant to the faithful *indulgences*, that is, remission of temporal punishment—including in the phrase "temporal punishments" the pains of purgatory.

That the whole notion rests on a misunderstanding of Scripture is evident. Our Lord's answer to the young man was to show him—not what he might do over and above the Commandments—but what he yet lacked (Matt. xix. 20) in his keeping of the Commandments: and as he went away Christ's comment was, "How hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God." It was unfitness to enter Christ's kingdom, not unfitness to do a work of extraordinary piety, of which Christ spoke. Again, the Romanists err in instancing what St. Paul says about his glorying in not being chargeable to the Church (1 Cor. ix. 15). He does not mean that his refusal of remuneration was meritorious in God's sight, but that he valued it as improving his position and influence with his converts.

As to what our Lord says about celibacy, that some men have chosen it for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake (Matt. xix. 12), and what St. Paul says to the same effect in the passage already alluded to (1 Cor. vii. 25), it is plain, from a careful study of the passages, that our Lord and His Apostle only meant to say that *to some persons* a single life was more favourable to a growth in grace than a married life, but by no means that it was in itself holier or meritorious. From

the whole tenor of Scripture it is abundantly clear, that, so far from any one being able to *exceed* the requirements of God's law, no one, not even the holiest, can fully keep them. The passage quoted in the Article (from Luke xvii. 10), among a hundred others, shows this. When a man can say that he loves God with all his strength, and that he is perfectly unselfish in his dealings with his fellow-men, then, and not till then, may he begin to speak of having fulfilled the precepts and going on to counsels of perfection.

ARTICLE XV.

Of Christ alone without Sin.

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin (as St. John saith) was not in Him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

Notes.—**In the truth of our nature.** A theological phrase meaning that Christ was "perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." That rational soul and that human flesh, however, inherited no taint or infection of sin.

As St. John saith: in his first Epistle (iii. 5), "Ye

know that He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin."

We the rest . . . offend in many things. "For in many things we offend all" (James iii. 2).

If we say that we have no sin, etc. (1 John i. 8).

The doctrine of this Article is twofold.

(1) The first assertion is that the nature which Christ took of the Virgin Mary, though perfectly human, was free from corruption. If sin were a part of our nature (as the Manichæans taught) this could not be: but sin is no part of our nature; it is the *fault* of our nature, an evil addition to it, not of its essence. The human nature which Christ took had indeed a *liability* to sin: so had Adam before his fall. Without this liability to sin Christ could not have been "in all things tempted like as we are" (Heb. iv. 15). But liability to sin is totally distinct from that tendency to sin which *we* inherit, and which is the original sin of Article IX.

(2) The second part of the Article affirms that "all other men offend in many things," even though baptized and born again.

This seems to be directed against two Romish errors,—one that Baptism removes original sin entirely, the other that the Virgin Mary was sinless.

As was seen in Article IX., the English Church teaches that Baptism removes not the infection, but the guilt only, of original sin.

As regards the Virgin Mary,—whose sinlessness and immaculate conception Duns Scotus and the Franciscans, about the year 1300, began to teach,—there is no foundation whatever for such a doctrine in Holy

Scripture. That she was "highly favoured," and "blessed among women," and doubtless unusually sanctified, we may at once admit; but our Lord's words, "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it" (Luke xi. 27), seem to forbid the notion that the mere fact of being the mother of the sinless Saviour proved her sinlessness.

LESSON VII.

OF SIN AND THE PARDON OF SIN—*CONTINUED*

ARTICLE XVI.

Of Sin after Baptism.

NOT every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

Notes.—**Deadly sin.** It was Tertullian and the Montanists who distinguished between *venial* sins and *deadly* sins, maintaining that the last were unpardonable. They based the distinction on 1 John v. 16, 17, who speaks of "sin unto death" and "sin not unto death," forbidding us to pray for the first.

Origen understood this passage and Hebrews x. 26

to mean denying the faith after Baptism; and thought that this was "the sin against the Holy Ghost" spoken of by our Lord as "never to be forgiven" (Matt. xii. 31). This rigorous doctrine of Origen's was adopted by the Novatians in the third century, and by some of the fanatical sects who arose about the time of the Reformation, against whom this Article is directed. All these passages,—the passage about the sin against the Holy Ghost, and that in St. John's Epistle, and the two passages in Hebrews (vi. 4-6, and x. 32), are capable of another interpretation.

(1) The warning about the sin against the Holy Ghost was occasioned by the Pharisees' rejection of our Lord. Christ declares that this might *then* be forgiven, for "the Son of Man" was veiling His divinity; He had not put forth the full power of His Gospel; "the Spirit was not yet given." But He warns them that if they continued to reject Him when glorified and attested by the Holy Ghost, it would be unpardonable, for then the means of grace would have been exhausted.

(2) This seems to be the meaning of St. John in his Epistle, that "the sin unto death" is final and obstinate obduracy when all the efforts of the Spirit have been exhausted. While the plant of God's Grace is still alive in the heart there is hope. When the heart is "*dead* in trespasses and sins," and has deliberately renounced God, *then* there is no hope.

(3) The fearful passages in Hebrews seem to point to the same desperate state. In vi. 4-6 we read that "it is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift . . . . if they fall away, to renew them again to repentance," meaning

that God in Christ offers us His only method of salvation, and if we deliberately reject this, God has no other method of winning us to repentance. Precisely the same is the meaning of the words in x. 26-29: "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.*" Under the *Jewish* Law the priests kept renewing their sacrifices day by day, year by year continually. Not so Christ: He has offered but *one* sacrifice for sin; if we reject that, there remains none other to bring us to God.

Thus in all these passages the sin spoken of is a state of sin, a desperate hardening of the heart: whoever is distressed lest haply he has fallen into this sin, shows by that very distress that he has *not* committed it. Short of this desperate hardness all may, "by the grace of God, rise again and amend their lives." And this is the uniform teaching of Holy Scripture.

All these same passages tend to show that none of us are secure from falling into sin. And this the Article declares in the concluding clause. When St. John in his first Epistle (iii. 9) asserts that every one that is born of God cannot sin because of the seed of God which is in him, he means (as St. Jerome points out) that "the regenerate man cannot sin while he continues in the generation of God; . . . but if we admit sin, and the devil enters into the door of our hearts, Christ goes away." It is the "new Man" within us that "cannot sin;" but the "old man" is ever liable to return and regain the upper hand.

ARTICLE XVII.

Of Predestination and Election.

Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So, for curious and

carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfal, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

Notes.—**Before the foundations of the world were laid.** The authority for this is to be found in Eph. i. 4.

Vessels made unto honour. The phrase is St. Paul's,—Rom. ix. 21.

Wretchlessness. Probably a mis-spelling. Recklessness used to be spelt "rechelessness," and is the word intended; it means utter carelessness.

Generally set forth. What is spoken *of classes* (*genera*) of men is said to be of "general" application; what is said *of individuals* is said to be of "particular" application. So what is here meant, is that we receive God's promises as applying to *classes* of men rather than to individuals.

Predestination. The history of this doctrine is instructive.

The early Fathers speak continually of God's election, but they mean election to grace, not to final glory, and the "elect" are the members of the Church. Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, believed

that the number of the elect was fixed, and that the world must last until this number was completed; but they never taught that any particular persons were predestined to be of the number.

Augustine, in controversy with the Pelagians, pushed the doctrine much further, asserting not only a predestination of *individuals* to grace, but also a "*gift of perseverance.*"

This was objected to by Hilary of Arles and other Gallican Christians as something new, and as constituting a Church within a Church,—an election to glory from among the elect to grace.

Calvin went even further than Augustine, denying the Arminian notion (that predestination merely means foreknowledge), and asserting that predestination is arbitrary, dooming certain individuals to final salvation and others to final damnation.

Turning now to this Article, we observe (1) that it says nothing of reprobation; (2) that it says nothing of the motive or *cause* of predestination, leaving it open to us to accept the solution of Origen and the Arminians, that it rests on God's foreknowledge of our deservings;[1] (3) that the phrases by which election is described are the very phrases applied constantly by our Church to Baptism, "delivered from curse and damnation," "called to salvation," "justified freely," "made sons of God by adoption." (4) We observe, lastly, an emphatic caution that we must receive the promises of God "as they be *generally* set forth in Holy Scripture,"—that is, as offered to *mankind*, not to this or that individual. For what says Scripture? "That *whosoever* believeth in Him should have ever-

[1] See Theodoret on Romans viii. 30.

lasting life" (John iii. 16); "Who will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4).

No one, observing these four points, can fail to see that this Article does not teach Calvinism.

The Article was purposely made comprehensive, capable of being subscribed by the *Arminian*, who resolved predestination into God's foreknowledge of our faith and deservings, as well as by the *Augustinian*, who asserted God's predestination to be absolute.

Indeed the latter half of the Article seems intended to imply that the controversy between these two views is an unprofitable one, and best avoided.

We may sum the teaching of Scripture on this subject thus:—

From the very first it has been God's will and purpose to gather a Church out of the world; and it is simply due to His sovereign will and pleasure that some nations and individuals have the privilege of admission into this Church offered them, and some have not (Deut. ix. 5, x. 15; Eph. i. 4, 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9). As to those who have not this privilege offered them, we may rest assured that He Who knoweth all things will judge men according to their opportunities at the last great day (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 11-16); as to those who have this privilege offered them, every one so elected is predestined to glory (John vi. 37, 39), and has power to attain to it,—if he forfeit it (and forfeit it he may) it is entirely due to his own wilfulness and in spite of God's election.[1]

[1] In the famous passage (Rom. viii. 30) we must carefully note that the verbs (called, justified, glorified) are all in the *past* tense, not in the *future*. By the word "glorified" St. Paul meant probably what in Ephesians ii. 6 he expresses by the words "made to sit in heavenly

ARTICLE XVIII.

Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.

They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

Notes.—**They also are to be had accursed.** The word "also" seems to be used in continuation of the last clause of the sixteenth Article; and the phrase "are to be had accursed" (in the Latin "*anathematizandi*") here is probably merely a variation of the phrase "are to be condemned" (*damnandi*) there; both phrases meaning *to be judged heretical.* The Church reprobates the opinion, without meaning for a moment that one who is so heretical as to hold it is necessarily a reprobate.

Who presume to say, etc. *Latitudinarians* are here condemned, who say that so long as a man lives conscientiously, it matters not what his religious opinions are. It has been said by a popular modern writer that "all genuine faith is of equal value,—the value being in the act of faith more than in the *object.*"

places," referring to our *present* glorious privileges. In the no less famous passage about the Potter (Rom. xi. 21) we must observe that he is said to make some for nobler, some for meaner uses, but none for destruction.

This Article asserts the contrary, that it is of the utmost importance that our faith be directed to those eternal truths which God has revealed to us in His Word.

The question of the eventual salvability of the heathen is not touched by this Article. Sundry passages in Scripture (for example, Acts xvii. 26-31 and Rom. ii. 11-16) imply that they may be eventually saved. Indeed, Holy Scripture says distinctly that Christ died not for our sins only, "but for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2), and in Matt. xxv. 37, we learn that many will find that they are redeemed by Christ who in this world never knew Him. But this is neither affirmed nor denied in this Article. But manifestly the Article is addressed only to those who have the Name of Christ "set forth" to them; and to them it says distinctly, "There is none other Name whereby you can be saved."

It is, moreover, of the utmost importance to remember that very usually, in the Church's formularies, the words "saved" and "salvation" are used to denote a *present* rather than a future *state*. A man may obtain salvation *hereafter*, and yet he may be outside the pale of salvation *now*. For instance, who can doubt that Cornelius ("a devout man, and one that feared God and prayed to God alway") would have been a saved man in the other world if he had died before he sent for Peter? But what saith the Angel? Send to Joppa, and call for Simon surnamed Peter, "who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be *saved*." Clearly the word *saved* here points to a present privilege,—the privilege of being in communion

with Christ in this world,—quite irrespective of what shall be hereafter.

In this sense of the word "salvation," it is absolutely true that *outside the pale of the Christian Church there is no salvation* ("extra ecclesiam nulla salus"). This was continually affirmed by the ancient Christian Fathers (as in our Athanasian Creed); and if any think it harsh towards the heathen who have never known Christ, he merely shows that he misunderstands the word *salvation.* What the Fathers meant was, that a man who was outside the pale of the Church was losing the inestimable *present* privilege of being in communion with Christ, without in the least prejudging his doom hereafter. A missionary is fired by a burning desire to bring the heathen within the pale of the Christian Church,—not because he thinks that if left outside that pale they will necessarily perish everlastingly,—but because he knows, on the authority of Scripture, that while outside that pale they are losing the present blessedness of knowing their Saviour, and of being now in communion with Him.

To conclude:—This Article condemns the notion that every man will be saved if he live conscientiously according to the religion which he professes, whatever that religion be. And this may be interpreted in either of two senses, both senses being true. It may mean: (*a*) No man who has Christianity fairly offered to him, and rejects it, can hope for salvation either now or hereafter, however conscientiously he live in that other religion which he prefers. Or it may mean: (*b*) No man who is outside the pale of the Christian Church, though it may be through no fault of his own, and though he be living ever so conscientiously, can be

supposed to be a sharer in the *present* blessedness of salvation. He is *now* at any rate outside the ark of salvation, whatever be his destiny hereafter.

For both these assertions we have the plain authority of Holy Scripture.

For the first (*a*), we have our Lord's words in Mark xvi. 16. Our Lord had just been charging His Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature; He adds,—clearly speaking of those to whom they should preach it, and of none other,—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And again: "He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day" (John xii. 48).

For the second assertion (*b*), we have the notable case of Cornelius, already referred to, a God-fearing man of most conscientious life, who notwithstanding needed Baptism in order that he might be "saved" in this latter sense of the term (Acts xi. 14). And again: "The Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved" (ii. 47). So again St. Peter: "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us" (doth put us in a present state of salvation; 1 Pet. iii. 21).

LESSON VIII.

OF THE CHURCH.

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Church.

THE visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite unto the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

Notes.—**A congregation.** Used here, not for a group of people assembled in one place, but for the whole number of God's people; as continually in the Pentateuch,—"That soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel," Exod. xii. 19, for instance; and as in Ps. lxxiv. 2, "O think upon Thy congregation, whom Thou hast purchased and redeemed of old."

Of faithful men. Believers in Jesus Christ;—not "faithful" in the sense of trustworthy.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred. As these were the three Patriarchates of the Eastern Church, it seems likely that the whole Eastern Church is intended; and if so, the error spoken of is probably that error which divided them, and still divides them, from the Western Church, namely, the denial of the Holy Spirit's *procession from the Son.* As the Roman Church attributed error to the Eastern Church, without denying that it was a branch of the Church; so we attribute error to the Roman Church, without denying that it is a branch of the Church. We deny the infallibility of the Roman Church, just as the Roman Church denies the infallibility of the Eastern. This is the meaning of the latter part of the Article.

It will be seen that *three* points are insisted on as essential to the idea of the Church of Christ; and it will be further seen, as we proceed, that these three imply a fourth and a fifth point.

1. That the Church is a *visible body of believers.*
2. That the *pure Word of God* is preached in it.
3. That the *Sacraments* are duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance. The two latter points will be seen to require a *Ministry;* and the third point will be seen to involve *discipline,* making thus *five* points in all,—five *notes* of the Church.

I. *A visible body of believers.*

It must be abundantly plain to every candid reader of the New Testament that Christ intended not only to save individual souls, but also to establish a society upon the earth. Our Lord's word is "*kingdom.*" The Jews were expecting that the Messiah would estab-

lish a kingdom, but their notion of this kingdom was an erroneous one; they thought it would be of like kind with the great empires which the world had already seen. Christ, therefore, is ever at pains to correct this notion; His kingdom is to be not an earthly but a Heavenly kingdom, a "Kingdom of Heaven,"—that is, a kingdom whose King shall be in Heaven, though His subjects be on earth. But though the kingdom is to be of this Heavenly, spiritual nature, not coming "with observation," but growing silently like a plant, yet clearly it is to be an easily-recognized *visible* Society; it was to be like a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid; Christ's prayer was that it might have unity (John xvii. 21, 23), meaning evidently a *visible* unity, for He goes on to speak of the effect of this on the world,—"that the world may know" the truth of His mission. So St. Paul, speaking of the unity of the Church, says there is one *Body* as well as one spirit,—clearly implying an outward visible *organization* (Eph. iv. 4). Throughout the Acts of the Apostles the Churches which the Apostles established are spoken of as public institutions, with their officers and places of meeting known to all, never as secret societies. It is a mixed society:—The Kingdom of Heaven (*i.e.* the Church) was to be like a net cast into the sea, gathering of all sorts, good and bad; it was to be like a field in which both tares and wheat were sown:—were the tares to be gathered out? no; both were to grow together till the harvest; so the Church was to be a mixed society till the Day of Judgment. Such was clearly Christ's intention. And yet no less clearly is it a Heavenly kingdom, mystically united to Christ, the Spouse of Christ, the Body of Christ, the Temple of the Holy Ghost. All

these glorious phrases may be true, and yet numbers may be suffered to belong to it now, and partake of its high privileges, who will fall away and be weeded out at the great purging of the Church at the Day of Judgment. Then at last Christ will present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; holy and without blemish (Eph. v. 27).

II. The Church being such, how is it to be known? How are we to recognize the true branches? For the word Churches in the plural is sanctioned in Scripture, meaning *branches* of the One Church Catholic. So Hooker: "As the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Catholic Church is, in like sort, divided into a number of distinct societies, every of which is termed a Church within itself" (*Ecc. Pol.* iii. i. 14). The question then is, how are we to be sure of any such distinct Society or Community that it is a true branch of the One Church Catholic? What must be its notes or marks?

The pure Word of God must be preached in it. This is one of the two notes insisted on in this Article. By "Word of God" here, it need hardly be said, the Article does not intend the *written* word merely, but the doctrine held and sanctioned in all fundamental matters of faith. The Church was to be the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15). It hath the promise that the Spirit shall guide her into all truth (John xvi. 13). St. Paul speaks of "the faith" as "*One*" (Eph. iv. 5), and St. Jude of "the faith once delivered to the Saints" (Jude 3). St. Paul says, "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 9).

Thus from Holy Scripture we learn that any so-called Church which teaches vital error cannot be a branch of the true Church.

The question here at once arises, what is vital error? in other words, what are the fundamental doctrines of Christianity in which all true branches of the Church must be agreed? How does our Church answer this question? The question addressed to those who seek admission to Baptism, and again in sickness, whether they accept the Creed,—the public repetition of all the three Creeds in our Services,—the adhesion of the Reformers to the decrees of the first four General Councils which sanctioned these Creeds,—all this makes it (us Bishop Harold Browne says) almost certain that our Church allows all Communities that truly hold the three Creeds to be branches of the Church of Christ, provided they also fulfil the further condition which follows.

III. This other note of a Church is that the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance. We have direct authority for adding stedfastness in the Sacraments to stedfastness in doctrine. For, in Acts ii. 42, we read of the primitive Church that it "continued stedfast in the breaking of bread" as well as in "the Apostles' doctrine." And that Baptism is also necessary we know from Christ's words to Nicodemus, that a man could only enter the Kingdom by being born of *Water* and of the Spirit; and St. Paul's notes of the Church, One Lord, One faith, One *Baptism* (Eph. iv. 5).

These two Sacraments, therefore, are regarded as essential to any community claiming to be a branch of the true Church.

IV. But we may go further: God's Word is to be *preached* as well as held. "How shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they *be sent?*" And again, the Sacraments are to be duly ministered,—implying a *ministry*. Thus an authorized ministry is clearly an essential note of a Christian Church.

V. And lastly, the due ministration of the Sacraments clearly implies discipline. The Sacraments cannot be duly ministered, unless there reside somewhere in the Church that power of admission and rejection, with which Christ so expressly invested His Apostles and the Church of the first age, and which He clearly intended to be transmitted to the Church of subsequent ages.

To conclude: this Article would seem to allow the claim to be a branch of the Church of Christ to every community of Christians, among whom the doctrine of the three Creeds is upheld and preached, and among whom the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion are duly ministered by an ordained ministry.

It is to be regretted that the Church's large and liberal definition, as given in this Article, has been so narrowed in the definition of the *Established Church* laid down from time to time in Acts of Parliament. The rigid requirements of *uniformity* enforced by Parliament in past times, drove numbers into Dissent whom the wise latitude of the Article would include among the members of the true Church of Christ.

ARTICLE XX.

Of the Authority of the Church.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

Notes.—**Rites or Ceremonies**: clearly distinguished here from doctrines. For whereas it is said that the Church may *decree* rites or ceremonies, it is not said that the Church may decree doctrines, but only decide authoritatively what are and what are not the ancient doctrines. This distinction runs through the limitations which follow. Holy Scripture is to limit the decreeing of rites and ceremonies, and Holy Scripture is to limit the determination of doctrine; but in different ways:—Rites and ceremonies are to be *not contrary to* Scripture, but they need not have the authority of Scripture; whereas for the determination of a doctrine it is not enough that it be *not contrary to* Scripture, it must directly rest on the authority of Scripture. This last requirement, that for doctrine the Church must have the positive authority of Scripture, is further guarded. It is not enough to find in Scrip-

ture some text or texts which support it; the Church is responsible also for seeing that it is consistent with the whole teaching of Scripture. She is forbidden to interpret one passage in a sense that would make it repugnant to another passage. For instance, the passage, "My Father is greater than I" (John xiv. 28), taken alone, might be interpreted so as to support Arian doctrine. But this Article forbids the Church to interpret that passage in any sense that shall make it repugnant to that other passage, "I and My Father are one" (x. 30). Hence the Church is bound to interpret the former as spoken of Christ in His temporary humiliation, so bringing it into harmony with that other passage which speaks of His eternal nature.

Although the whole body of the Reformers approved of the latter part of this Article, imposing these limitations on the authority of the Church, yet a large portion of them—the Puritan party—objected strongly to *the first clause* of it, conceding to the Church the power of decreeing *rites and ceremonies*. They wanted to forbid all ritual which had not the direct authority of Scripture (such as the surplice, the cross in Baptism, etc.). The framers of the Articles of 1552, and of the first draft in 1562, desiring to conciliate this party, omitted the clause. But wiser counsels prevailed, and in the Articles of 1571 (approved by Convocation, ratified by the Crown, and enforced by Parliament), the clause was inserted, giving to the National Church the power of decreeing its own rites and ceremonies, so long as they are "not contrary to" Holy Scripture.

LESSON IX.

OF THE CHURCH— *CONTINUED.*

ARTICLE XXI.

Of the Authority of General Councils.

GENERAL Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

Notes.—**General Councils.** Councils professing to represent the *whole* Church, as opposed to *Provincial* Councils, in which a part only of the Church Catholic was represented. During the first three centuries there were no General Councils, nor indeed could there be: the Roman Emperors being hostile to Christianity, any such large gathering of Bishops would have only provoked persecution. In the fourth century, just

when a General Council was most needed to define the Church's Creed, God's Providence so ordered it that the difficulty was removed. Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, eagerly approved the design of calling together an *Œcumenical*, that is, a *world-wide*, Council; and at Nicæa (A.D. 325) 318 Bishops, besides priests and deacons, were assembled from all parts of Christendom. At this Council Arianism was condemned.

In 381, the Emperor Theodosius summoned a second General Council at Constantinople, at which Macedonius was condemned, and the doctrine of the Holy Ghost declared, completing the Nicene Creed.

In 431, under the younger Theodosius, the Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorius, and determined the doctrine of the Incarnation.

In 451, Marcianus called the Council of Chalcedon, which—notwithstanding the bitterness and animosities which disgraced it—did good service in condemning Eutyches, and further defining the twofold Nature of Christ, as set forth in the Athanasian Creed.

These four Councils were recognized as authoritative by a clause in the Act of Supremacy of 1558, which (though since repealed) may be taken as expressing the mind of the Reformers. General Councils are not inspired, and are not infallible; the authority of these four Councils rests simply on the fact that their decrees have met with universal acceptance, and have been admitted by the whole body of Christians to interpret correctly the teaching of Holy Scripture. To set forth the teaching of Scripture was, indeed, the only purpose which they proposed to accomplish. Thus, as Bishop Harold Browne puts it, "these General Synods have received an authority which they had not in themselves."

There were two other General Councils (in 553 and 680) called by Emperors, and truly Œcumenical, but they merely confirmed the decrees of the preceding Councils.

First, the breaking up of the Roman Empire (making centralized action difficult), then the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches (A.D. 1053), and lastly, the great separation of the sixteenth century, have made a General Council well-nigh impossible: in the Council of Trent (miscalled "general") neither the Greek nor the Reformed Churches were represented.

ARTICLE XXII.

Of Purgatory.

The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

Notes.—**The Romish doctrine.** Called Romish because the doctrines condemned in this Article were being decreed, at the very time when this Article was written, at the Council of Trent, in which the Romish Church only was represented. Of the unscriptural doctrines affirmed by this Council, *four* are condemned in this Article, namely:—

1. **Purgatory.** This error may be traced to a misinterpretation of 1 Cor. iii. 11-15. In that passage St. Paul is speaking of the work of Christian ministers in building up the Church; and he says "the Day" shall

declare of what sort each man's work is, for "*the fire*" shall try it. St. Paul may mean the fiery trial of persecution, or he may mean the Day of Judgment; in either case he is clearly speaking of the effectiveness of the Pastor's ministry as that which will be thus tested.

The Romanist doctrine of *purgatory* affirms that there is a period of suffering between death and Judgment through which all men (except a few favoured Saints) are supposed to pass. It need hardly be pointed out how directly it contradicts the teaching of Holy Scripture about the blessedness of the dead who die in the Lord, and how they rest from their labours (Rev. xiv. 13).

2. **Pardons or indulgences.** These were originally mere shortenings of the terms of penance which the Church had imposed. Soon it came to be taught that such relaxations of penance might be earned by almsgiving; and as all gifts to the Church were included in almsgiving, the custom of purchasing pardons by money payments grew up. Then, to increase this lucrative traffic, the Pope began to claim the power of shortening penance in the other world as well as in this; and so, by working on the fears of superstitious men, enormous gains were made; until at last the scandal of this trade in indulgences became too great to be tolerated, and over one half of Europe it was abolished by the Reformation.

3. **Worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques.** The Christians of the first ages, more afraid of idolatry than those of later ages, forbade all images of Him Whom we worship,—allowing only symbols or emblems, such as the Lamb, the

Cross, the Dove, the Good Shepherd (see Augustine's commenting on the 113th Psalm). As time went by, however, pictures and images began to be used for the instruction of the ignorant; and people were taught to *venerate* them, though the priests were careful to explain that this *veneration* was something different from the worship which is due to God. The Council of Trent ordered that the same honour and veneration should be paid to reliques of Saints that was paid to images. And this *veneration* quickly passed, as it was sure to pass, into *worship* among the uneducated. Most clearly and expressly does the Second Commandment forbid us to make any graven image in order to worship it.[1] How far historical sculptures or pictures may be safely introduced into churches without fear of any breach of the Second Commandment, is a question which must be left to the discretion of each age and church.

4. **Invocation of Saints.** The Romanists, believing that certain favoured saints had been admitted to glory immediately at death, taught that *their* intercession, as well as that of the Angels, might be asked in prayer, and the practice of prayer to the Saints spread rapidly, and most of all to the Virgin Mary. Even before the close of the fourth century the error showed itself, and the early Fathers frequently protest against it. Athanasius reminds his readers how St. Peter forbade Cornelius[2] to worship him, and how the Angel forbade St. John;[3] and adds that it belongs to God, and to God only, to receive worship. Most clearly does Holy Scripture assert that there is but "One Medi-

[1] That this is the force of the original Hebrew seems to be admitted.
[2] Acts x. 26; see also xiv. 14. [3] Rev. xxii. 9.

ator between God and man" (1 Tim. ii. 5). Once indeed, and once only, did a created being claim worship :— "All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." And crushing was the answer, "Get thee hence, Satan ; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

ARTICLE XXIII.

Of Ministering in the Congregation.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

Notes.—**The Congregation.** This word is used, as it is used in the 19th Article, not in its modern, but in its Scriptural sense, for *the whole company of God's covenanted people*, that is, the Church. And in the Latin version of the Article, the word is *Ecclesia*, or Church.

Men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation. These are defined in the 36th Article to be the Bishops. The reason why the word "Bishops" was avoided in this Article is to be found in the fact that this Article was the result of a conference of Lutheran and Anglican divines ; and the Lutherans being then (to their great

regret) under the ban of the Continental Bishops—few of whom sided with Luther—a phrase that could be used by both was adopted.

Two things are plainly affirmed in this Article:

(1) The distinction between Clergy and Laity.

(2) The need of ordination for the Clergy.

(1) The setting apart of certain members of the Christian Church to be her *ministers* dates from the very foundation of the Church. "When He ascended up on high, He gave gifts unto men. . . . He gave (or constituted) some (as) apostles, and some (as) prophets, and some (as) evangelists, and some (as) pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 8-12). So we read that the Apostles ordained *Elders* (presbyters or priests[1]) in every city (Acts xiv. 23). These "elders" are addressed as men whom the Holy Ghost had made overseers of the flock —pastors who were "to feed the Church of God" (Acts xx. 28). "Bishops and Deacons" are expressly mentioned (Phil. i. 1). St. Paul asks "How shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.)

(2) The need of some authority competent to ordain the Clergy clearly follows, and is no less plainly recognized in Scripture. While the Apostles lived *they* had this authority, intrusted to them by Christ Himself; and therefore in the New Testament we hear of the Apostles appointing two orders of Clergy only, a higher called indifferently "Elders" (*presbyteri*), or "Overseers" (*episcopi*), and a lower order called "Deacons." After the death of the Apostles, we find mention made within a very few years of *three* orders,

[1] The words *presbyter* and *priest* are etymologically the same.

the name "Overseers" (*episcopi*) being now appropriated to the highest; "Elders" (*presbyteri*) to the second; and "Deacons" (*diaconi*) being still the name of the third order. Ignatius, writing within ten years of St. John's death, mentions all three orders distinctly, and insists strenuously on the importance of obeying the Bishop. Irenæus, writing two generations later, dwells as earnestly on the need of a continued succession of Bishops in every Church, giving the list of those who had presided over the Roman Church from the time of the Apostles down to his own age. The office which Timothy and Titus held, the one at Ephesus and the other in Crete, selecting and ordaining ministers and enforcing discipline on all, so carefully defined in St. Paul's pastoral epistles, is manifestly the model on which Episcopacy was afterwards constituted. The *name*[1] of the Church's highest officers is clearly unimportant; in this Article, as we have seen, it is perhaps purposely omitted; but the fact that from the time of the Apostles downwards there have been such officers responsible for the *ordination* of the rest is manifest.

ARTICLE XXIV.

Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understanded of the people.

[1] Various names occur, equivalent to Bishop, in the early Church History:—Overseer, Angel, President, Chief Pastor,—but always meaning one who is competent to ordain others.

Notes.—**Repugnant to the Word of God.** "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned (the seat of the laity) say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing that he understandeth not what thou sayest?" "In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." (1 Cor. xiv.)

The wonder is how such a monstrous custom ever arose as the use of a language not understood by the people in public worship. The explanation, doubtless, is to be found that at one time *Latin* was almost universally understood in Western Christendom—Christendom being then confined to the Roman Empire; and that French, Spanish, and Italian, were all in fact gradual corruptions of the Latin language.

LESSON X.

OF THE SACRAMENTS—BAPTISM.

ARTICLE XXV.

Of the Sacraments.

SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

Notes.—**Sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace.** Witnesses, as a parchment deed is the witness of a gift or sale; effectual signs, as the parchment deed is effectual as a *conveyance* of the property. Just so in our Catechism, sacraments are said to be "pledges" as well as "means whereby we receive" grace.

By the which He doth work invisibly in us. "Which" refers to the Sacraments,—"by the which Sacraments." The Latin version makes this evident.

There are two Sacraments. Our Homily allows that "in general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified;" but more strictly it defines Sacraments to be those "visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ." And the Homily proceeds to show that there are only *two* which strictly fulfil this definition. Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Chrysostom, and Augustine, distinguish Baptism and the Lord's Supper from all other Christian ordinances.

Of "**those five commonly called Sacraments.**" *Matrimony* is "a state of life allowed (old

English for approved or commended) in the Scriptures," spoken of as a symbol of the union of Christ and the Church, by St. Paul, who adds, "this mystery is great," which the Vulgate rendered "magnum est sacramentum," so giving rise to the error of calling matrimony a Sacrament; *extreme unction*, practised as it came to be practised, was a mere superstition, arising from what the Article calls "a corrupt following" (*i.e.* an erroneous imitation) of the practice of the Apostles, —doubtless alluding to the passages, Mark vi. 13 and James v. 14, where anointing with oil is spoken of as an outward sign used in miraculous cures.

Confirmation in the primitive Church was a part of the baptismal service, but afterwards came to be separated from it, partly because of the difficulty of obtaining the presence of a Bishop at baptisms, and partly from the evident desirableness of delaying it in the case of those who were baptized in infancy. Both Confirmation and *Ordination* are in some sense sacraments, both having the outward apostolic sign of imposition of hands, and both being accompanied (as we believe) by an inward and spiritual grace. But of neither can we say that they are "generally necessary to salvation." *Penance* clearly does not fulfil the definition of a sacrament given in the Homily and Catechism. As practised by the Church of Rome, it too often becomes a dangerous superstition superseding real repentance; and may be said therefore to have "grown from the corrupt following of the Apostles."

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon. Our Church forbids any adoration of the elements, denying the truth of the doctrine by which the Roman Church defends such

adoration, namely, that "the grace of the Sacraments is contained in the Sacraments." (Council of Trent.) In opposition to this doctrine our Church maintains that the Sacraments have no efficacy of their own nature, but are ordinances of God by which He has promised to convey His grace to all who "worthily receive the same." The grace is received *directly* from God, and therefore the elements are not to be adored as though they contained it. The Romanists, believing that the grace is *in the element*, teach consistently that it is received by all who receive the element,—by some to life, by some to death. But this was not the teaching of the early Fathers, nor is it the teaching of the Church of England. (See Art. xxix.)

ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, be-

cause of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty, by just judgement be deposed.

Notes.—"**In the visible Church:**"—the Church in this world;—in the invisible Church within the veil it is not so.

The evil be ever mingled with the good. Christ foretold this in the Parable of the Tares and the Net and the Marriage Feast; see Article xix.

They do not the same in their own name. This is the root of the matter. The grace of God's Word and the grace of His Sacraments comes not from the Minister, but direct from God. The Montanists and Donatists, refusing to recognize Baptism at the hands of heretics, argued "How can grace be given by one who has it not?" The Church answers, "The grace is from God, not from the Minister." It was not the Apostles by their "own power or holiness" that worked the miracles, but "His Name, through faith in His Name." Paul may have "planted, and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7). Paul and Apollos were but "ministers by whom men believed, even as the Lord gave to every man." The treasure was in earthen vessels, that the excellency might be of God, and not of them (2 Cor. iv. 7).

ARTICLE XXVII.

Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

Notes.—**Regeneration or new Birth.** A sacrament must contain two things, an outward visible sign, and an inward spiritual grace. The Article asserts that Baptism has not only an "outward visible sign," distinguishing the Christian from the not-Christian; but it has also an inward spiritual grace, and this grace is defined to be, in one word, *Regeneration.* What is meant by Regeneration? It is our Lord's word (John iii. 5), and it is St. Paul's word (Tit. iii. 5), and it is St. Peter's word (1 Pet. i. 3, 23), for that change which takes place in us in Baptism. It is not a *moral* change, but a *spiritual* change. A moral change (that is, a change of heart and disposition) may or may not accompany it;—in the adult it may and ought, in the

infant it cannot. But the spiritual change (that is, a change in the spiritual conditions of our life) may take place in the infant no less than in the adult. We shall see this still more clearly when we have explained to ourselves the nature of this spiritual change. It is threefold. Just as we are baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; so the grace is threefold :—

1. We are made children of our heavenly Father.

2. We are translated into the kingdom of His dear Son.

3. We are brought under the influences of His Holy Spirit.

Let us consider each of these blessings separately.

1. *Adoption* to be God's children. "To them gave He power to become the sons of God" (John i. 12). "Beloved, now are we the sons of God" (1 John iii. 1). "Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15). And this implies *forgiveness*,—remission of all past sin in the case of the adult,—remission of the blame and displeasure under which our fallen race lies in the case of the infant. "Be baptized for the remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38). "Be baptized and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16). So in this Article, "**the promises of the forgiveness of sins are signed and sealed.**" Thus in Baptism we are pardoned, justified, restored to favour, brought into covenant, made God's children. This first.

2. Baptism translates us into Christ's kingdom, makes us (in other words) members of His Church; and if so, then members of Himself, for His Church is called in Scripture His Body. "By one spirit are we

all baptized into one Body;" "ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular" (*i.e.* individually) (1 Cor. xii. 12, 27). "The Church, which is His Body" (Eph. i. 26). "Thou being a wild olive-tree wert grafted in" (Rom. xi. 17). So in this Article, "**grafted into the Church.**" This second.

3. Baptism brings us under the influences of the Holy Spirit. For of this Body of which we are made members the Holy Spirit is the Soul. This Church into which we are translated is His Temple. Of that Vine into which we are grafted He is the vital sap. Therefore the promise of His blessed influence accompanies Baptism. In the case of the adult, we doubt not the Holy Spirit is there and then given, according to St. Peter's words, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins: and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). In the case of the infant, we do not say that there is what the schoolmen called "an infused habit of grace;" such language would be inapplicable to infants. But we say rather that, from that day forward, in God the Holy Ghost "he lives and moves and has his being." The Holy Spirit is the new element in which he henceforth lives. If we might venture to use the metaphor, he is transplanted into a new spiritual atmosphere, which is sure to strengthen him so soon as he begins to inhale it. Surely this breathing of a new breath of life may well be called new birth.

Such is the threefold privilege of Baptism, its inward spiritual grace, called "regeneration" or "new birth," on purpose to show that it is the free gift of God, not won by any effort of our

own, but God's gift just as much as natural birth is God's gift.

And if it be so, if it require no effort on the part of the baptized, then clearly infants are as capable of it as adults. Just as an unconscious plant may be conveyed from one master to another, may be grafted into a new stock, may be transplanted into a more genial climate, —so may the unconscious babe change masters, be grafted into Christ, and brought under the Holy Spirit's influence.

Some may say, "Nay, but is not Baptism of the nature of a covenant? and does not the Catechism tell us that faith and repentance are required? How then can it be right to baptize infants?"

The answer is a very simple one: Baptism *is* of the nature of a covenant, and repentance and faith *are* required. But so gracious and merciful is our heavenly Father, that He is satisfied with an *engagement* to repent and believe on our part: the adult *engages*, the infant *is engaged*, to renounce evil and embrace the faith. We enter on our "new life" under this engagement or obligation; and if in after years we fail to fulfil this engagement, just in that proportion do we forfeit these privileges of our new birth.

Most rightly therefore does the Article affirm in its last clause that "**the Baptism of young children is most agreeable with the institution of Christ.**"[1]

One only question remains. This "regeneration" being the inward and spiritual grace, how is it connected with the outward and visible sign? How can one be said to be the means of the other? The Article

[1] The Scripture proofs of this are given in Manual II.

answers the question in that most instructive phrase: **"Whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church."**

That the word "instrument" is to be understood in its *legal* sense (just as a deed is called an instrument of conveyance) is shown by the use of that other legal phrase, "the promises . . . . are signed and sealed." The Baptism is an instrument of conveyance, signed and sealed in the thrice Holy Name, whereby the child is transferred from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col. i. 13), so becoming part of Christ's "purchased possession" (Eph. i. 14).

LESSON XI.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

ARTICLE XXVIII.

Of the Lord's Supper.

THE Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Notes.—This Article is directed against two errors: first, the error of those (the "Zuinglians") who explain away the Sacramental character of the Lord's Supper, saying that it is only a bond of fellowship, "a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves," denying that there is therein any real participation in the Body and Blood of Christ. And second, the error of those who maintain a real participation in the Body and Blood of Christ, but lower the doctrine by an unworthy conception of the mode in which the participation is effected.

The Anglican Church, in common with the Roman and Lutheran Churches, believes in a real participation, but differs from both as to the mode in which Christ is received. For, as Hooker and Bishop Harold Browne point out, there are three principal opinions as to the mode in which Christ is received:—

1. The Romanists say by *Transubstantiation*, that is, by conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood; so that, though the appearance of bread and wine remain, yet their substance is gone, and in its place we have the substance of Christ's Body and Blood.

2. The Lutherans deny that there is any such conversion of substance; the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine; but as in red-hot iron there is the nature both of iron and of fire, so in the Eucharist there is both the substance of the bread and the substance of the Lord's Body. This is *Consubstantiation*.

3. Rejecting both these opinions, the English Church maintains a *real but spiritual partaking of Christ's Body and Blood* in the Lord's Supper; and this is the doctrine of the Article. "**To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking** (*a means of our partaking*, St. Paul's phrase in 1 Cor. x. 16) **of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking** (a means of our partaking) **of the Blood of Christ**;" but (as the Article proceeds to assert) this partaking is "**only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.**"

The meaning is clear. We consist of body and of spirit. By our body we are connected with the visible world, by our spirit we are connected with the unseen world. Christ is in the unseen world; it is by our spirits, therefore, that we feed on Him. While with our body we are feeding on the hallowed bread and wine according to His command, He, remembering His promise, is feeding us spiritually with His Body and His Blood. The two feedings go on *concurrently*, and the one is the condition and occasion of the other.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor (quoted by Bishop Harold Browne) expresses it thus:—"As Christ's Body is now a spiritual Body, so we expect a spiritual presence of that Body; and we do not believe that we naturally and carnally eat that which is no longer natural and carnal; but that we spiritually receive Christ's spiritual Body into our souls, and spiritually drink His life-giving Blood with the lips of our spirit." (Bishop Taylor *on the Real Presence*, i. 9-11.) The hallowed elements are a "means" of communicating to us this heavenly food, because the Word of Christ gives them this power;

just as in worldly affairs certain solemn words spoken over a parchment deed makes it a conveyance of an estate,—though the estate is not in the parchment.

That faith is necessary as "**a mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten,**" is asserted both here and in the 29th Article.

The Article asserts that the doctrine of Transubstantiation "**is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.**"

That the elements cease to be bread and wine after consecration is plainly contradictory to Scripture, for St. Paul still calls them after consecration "this bread" and "this cup" (1 Cor. xi. 27, 28). And so our Blessed Lord, after the wine had been blessed and partaken of, still called it "this fruit of the vine." Moreover, the very words of institution contradict the notion (as Bp. Bull points out); for Christ said, "This is My Body which is given (or broken) for you;" and "This is My Blood which is shed." Now we know that when He thus spake His Body was not yet given, nor was His Blood yet shed. Therefore "*This is*" must have been spoken by way of anticipation. And as it was spoken by way of *anticipation* then before the event, so is it spoken by way of *remembrance* by us now after the event.[1]

[1] That the verb "*is*" often means "must be conceived as being," is clear from many passages, *e.g.* Exod. xii. 11; Matt. xiii. 37-39; John x. 7, xv. 1; 1 Cor. x. 4. In Matt. xi. 14, speaking of the Baptist, our Lord said, "If ye will receive it, *this is* Elias which was for to come,"—where any literal interpretation of "*this is*" would be forbidden by John i. 21. So our Lord's words at the Last Supper are most naturally understood to mean, that *to all who will receive it the bread is in effect His body and the wine His blood.* If our Lord had meant that the bread was transubstantiated, He would have said, not "*this is*," but "*this becomes.*"

If further proof that Transubstantiation is repugnant to Scripture be needed, it may be found in the sixth chapter of St. John, for we are there told that *all* who feed on Christ have eternal life; if therefore the bread be Christ, then all who feed on the bread have eternal life; and this we know is not true, for wicked people have often fed on the hallowed bread.

The Article declares, moreover, that Transubstantiation **"overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament."** For it is the nature of a Sacrament to consist of two parts, the one being a sign of the other. If the two are merged in one, then there cease to be two parts. And, moreover, how can one thing be a sign of another thing if it be that other thing?

Lastly, it **"hath given occasion to many superstitions:"** and some are mentioned, the reservation, elevation, adoration, of the consecrated elements. If they are still, as Scripture declares, bread and wine, and therefore created things ("these Thy creatures of bread and wine," as our Prayer Book calls them at the moment of their reception), how can it be other than idolatry to adore them?—See the Protestation inserted in 1552, and again in 1661, after the Rubrics at the end of the Communion Service.

ARTICLE XXIX.

Of the Wicked which eat not of the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine

saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Notes.—**"As St. Augustine saith."** The Article is almost word for word taken from St. Augustine's 26th Treatise on St. John :—

"He who abides not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt eats not spiritually His Flesh, nor drinks His Blood, though he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the Sacrament of His Body and Blood; but rather, he eats and drinks to his condemnation the Sacrament of so great a thing." In this passage the word "Sacrament," it will be observed (as usual in those days), stands for what we now call the outward and visible part of the Sacrament.

Of course a believer in Transubstantiation believes that all who eat the bread eat the Body of Christ;—eat it either to their condemnation (so they interpret 1 Cor. xi. 29) or to their eternal life. But as Origen says, "If it were possible for the wicked to eat the Living Bread, in vain would it have been written, 'Whoso eateth this bread shall live for ever' (John vi. 58)."[1]

In truth that passage in John vi. forbids the notion that wicked communicants feed on Christ. And the passage in 1 Cor. xi. clearly means that he who comes profanely to the Lord's Table, so far from feeding on the Lord, shares the Jews' sin of rejecting Him.

[1] Origen in Matt. xv.

ARTICLE XXX.

Of both Kinds.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

The Romanists allow the clergy to receive both elements, but to the laity they give the bread only. They defend this practice by saying that each element is transubstantiated, and the whole Christ is contained in the bread. That this is unscriptural is clear, for Christ said expressly "Drink ye all of it," and St. Mark adds, "And they all drank of it" (xiv. 23).

We do not deny that a Romanist who is only allowed the bread may receive the full blessing; but this does not justify those who mutilate Christ's institution.

ARTICLE XXXI.

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

Notes.—**"The Offering of Christ once made."** —That "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," and that, beside this, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins" (Heb. ix. 28, x. 26), is the clear teaching of Scripture, repeated in our Prayer Book, "Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." What then is the meaning of the early Fathers when they continually speak of the Eucharist as "an Offering" or "Sacrifice"? The Fathers themselves answer the question: Clement, Justin, Irenæus, explain that in the Eucharist there is, *first*, a thank-offering of the fruits of the earth made when we place the bread and wine on the Holy Table, quoting Malachi i. 10, 11; and, *secondly*, "the sacrifice of praise and fruit of our lips" enjoined in Hebrews xiii. 15.

In the third century Cyprian began to speak of our presenting to God the sacrifice of His Son, but clearly he meant a pleading of the sacrifice once offered, not for one moment any repetition of it; he meant, in short, what St. Paul meant, when he tells us that in the Lord's Supper we "show" or announce "the Lord's Death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26); and what our Prayer Book means by the words, "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the Death of Christ." In this sense it is in truth not a sacrifice, but rather a feast upon a sacrifice.

LESSON XII.

OF THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

ARTICLE XXXII.

Of the Marriage of Priests.

BISHOPS, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

Notes.—It is plain from Scripture that some of the Apostles were married (Mark i. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 5); plain also that St. Paul assumed that most of those whom Timothy ordained would be married, bidding him prefer for the ministry those who brought up their children well (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4). In Hebrews (xiii. 4) we read that "marriage is honourable in all men;" and in 1 Tim. iv. 3 heretics "forbidding to marry" are specially condemned. Holy Scripture therefore abundantly justifies the assertion of this Article that God's law leaves it open to the Clergy to marry or not, as they shall judge most conducive to godliness.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

Of excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

Notes.—Our Lord empowered His Church to excommunicate and to absolve, in other words to exclude and to readmit members. (Matt. xviii. 15-18.) If the offending brother will not "hear the Church," when censured, "let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican" (the Jewish phrase for excommunication, adopted in this Article). In the 18th verse our Lord assured His disciples that these sentences of the Church would be approved in Heaven—would have the Divine sanction. This authority was on another occasion given to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and on another to all the Apostles (John xx. 23). That the Apostles exercised it, and approved of congregations exercising it, is clear from the case of the incestuous person whom St. Paul bade the Corinthians to excommunicate in full congregation ("when ye be gathered together," 1 Cor. v. 4), and whom he afterwards enjoins them to absolve and readmit to Christian privileges (2 Cor. ii. 5-11). In 1 Tim. i. 20, he speaks of having himself excommunicated Hymenæus and Alexander. In 1 Tim. v. 19-21, Tit. iii. 10, 11, St. Paul lays down

rules how these Bishops were to judge, rebuke, reject. From these passages we gather that our Lord gave the power of excommunication and absolution to the Church collectively, intending the Church to exercise it through her Ministers. "The judge who hath authority thereto" spoken of in the Article is in the English Church the Bishop. In the Rubric before the Communion Office the Minister of a Parish is directed, if he have occasion to repel any notorious evil liver from the Communion, to report the case at once to the Bishop.

Such is the doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Church on this subject: and such used to be the practice of our own Church. The peculiar nature of the connection between Church and State in England makes Church discipline difficult in our day.

ARTICLE XXXIV.

Of the Traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that

offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

Notes.—"**It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one.**" This is the first point of the Article. That all things "be done to edifying," and "done decently and in order," is the Apostolic rule (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40). But this was understood in the first ages to allow of latitude in things not prescribed in Scripture. Thus, some Churches observed Easter on a Sunday always, others on the 14th day of the first Jewish month, whatever week day it might be. Some kept the Jewish Sabbath as well as the Christian Sunday, others the latter only. Bishops drew up their own Liturgies. Thus the independence of National Churches in these matters is proved; though in doctrine and Apostolic government they were bound to uniformity. All this is further set forth in Cranmer's Preface to the Prayer Book.

"**He that offendeth against the common order of the Church**" to which he belongs "**ought to be rebuked.**" This is the second point. And indeed no society could exist without such authority over its own members. St. Paul reproves those who caused divisions (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 3). The two points of the Article are in perfect agreement. In matters that are not of Divine sanction National

Churches are independent of one another, and have authority over their own members.

ARTICLE XXXV.

Of the Homilies.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

The Names of the Homilies then follow.

Notes.—The Homilies were popular discourses published by the Reformers for the use of the Clergy who were not licensed to preach. The "First Book" is ascribed to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, and is the most valuable. The Second Book was edited by Jewel, in Queen Elizabeth's reign. Neither Book is of the same authority as the Prayer Book and its Rubrics.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth

contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing, that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

"**The Book of Consecration,**" &c. The *Ordinal*, or Ordination Service, set forth by Cranmer and the other Reformers in 1549, had been forbidden in Queen Mary's reign, and doubts thrown upon the validity of those who had been ordained in this form. On Queen Elizabeth's accession, the Reformed Ordinal was restored; and it was used in the consecration of Archbishop Parker, in Lambeth Chapel, by the Bishops Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Hodgkins. Hence the necessity of this Article to assert its authority and the validity of orders so conferred. In truth our Ordination Service resembles that of the early Church far more closely than that of the Romanists.

Two objections were made to it by the Puritans:—
1. They objected to the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," saying that man cannot bestow God's Spirit. The answer is a very simple one. Man does not pretend in this service to bestow the Holy Spirit; God, and God only, can bestow Him. But if God has promised that, on certain conditions, He will bestow this Gift, and those conditions have been fulfilled, then in the full assurance of faith we say, "Receive the

Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God." It need hardly be added that the words which follow, "Now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands," refer to the "Office and work of a Priest," not to the gift of the Spirit.

2. Their second objection was to the words "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." They said, "None can forgive sins but God." This is most true, and yet Christ gave His Apostles this power of "binding and loosing" sins. Clearly, therefore, it cannot mean either in Scripture, or in our Prayer Book, that kind of forgiveness which belongs to God and to God only: but rather that power of granting or withholding forgiveness which must belong to every society, and must be exercised through the officers of that society.

Sin is an offence against God; as such God only can forgive it. Sin is also an offence against the Church; as such the Priest has the power of forgiving or refusing to forgive it, and this he does in the Name of the Great Head of the Church.

The newly-ordained presbyter receives by Christ's own ordinance a divine commission to minister the Sacraments; and also (in the words before us) a divine commission of authority to grant or refuse admission to those Sacraments. Without Christ's promise of indemnity in Heaven none would venture to discharge so heavy a responsibility.

ARTICLE XXXVII.

Of the Civil Magistrates.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power

in this Realm of England, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which Title we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

Notes.—The difficult question of Church and State, in other words, the due relation between the *civil* and *ecclesiastical* powers in a Christian commonwealth, is here treated.

Where the State is *not* Christian, all difficulty disappears. Such was the case in the age of the Apostles, and such continued to be the case for three centuries. The kingdom of Christ in those days shrank from any direct connexion with the kingdoms of this world. Obedience to the heathen government was enjoined indeed by the Apostles in all things in which it could be rendered without disobedience to God. But in all internal affairs the Church of Christ was to be self-governing; and St. Paul expressly rebukes the Christians for going to law one with another in the Civil Courts (1 Cor. vi. 4). Under the sanction of this verse there grew up the ecclesiastical courts; and the Bishops were regarded with enthusiastic loyalty.

Then came the accession of Constantine, and the civil government was for the first time professedly Christian. This seemed to the Christians a triumph of their religion, a fulfilment of the prophecy that the kingdoms of the world should become the kingdoms of the Lord. The emperors, and, when the empire fell, the feudal kings who succeeded, found it needful to secure the favour of the priesthood; and so the wealth and power of the Bishops and Clergy increased rapidly, most of all that of the Bishop of Rome. The Clergy used their influence to curb tyranny, protect the poor, and foster learning; but too often at the same time they became worldly and ambitious. The ecclesiastical courts were retained, and the Clergy claimed exemption from the civil courts. And from the ecclesiastical courts all over Western Christendom there lay an appeal to Rome. In the Northern States of Europe, this allegiance of the Clergy to the Roman Bishop became at last intolerable; and the really

important point of the Reformation, considered politically, was the establishment of Queen Elizabeth's supremacy over all estates of men whether ecclesiastical or temporal. Thus the Pope's dominion over the Clergy was abolished. In the language of the Second Canon the King's majesty hath the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had among the Jews, and Christian emperors of the Primitive Church. The Article before us makes it plain that the Royal Supremacy confers not any of those powers which belong exclusively to the Church's priesthood, namely, the ministering of God's Word and Sacraments or the ordination of those who so minister.

Thus the English Church at the Reformation restored those relations of Church and State which were established under Constantine. Should the civil government at any future time cease to be professedly Christian, it would be no less clearly the duty of the Church to return to that condition of separation from the State which was her lot during the three first centuries.

The concluding clauses of the Article declare the lawfulness of capital punishment and of military service. In the Old Testament God's command to Noah was, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. ix. 6). In the New St. Paul writes of the magistrate, "He beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. xiii. 1-4).

As to war, for purposes of self-defence, or to put down moral evil by force, clearly so long as aggression and public wrong continue, war is the lesser evil, and

to be justified. Private revenge is forbidden in the New Testament, but not serving in war at the command of one's sovereign.

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

Of Christian men's Goods, which are not common.

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

In the early chapters of the Acts we read that the Christians "had all things in common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need" (ii. 44). What is here described was an enthusiastic impulse of self-sacrifice. But there was no surrender of what the Article calls "the right and title of the same." If property had been abolished, there would have been no self-denial in their alms-giving.

The Anabaptists here alluded to were a fanatical sect of Communists in Germany in the sixteenth century.

ARTICLE XXXIX.

Of a Christian man's Oath

As we confess that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not

prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

That vain and rash swearing is forbidden is clear from our Lord's language in Matt. v. 34, and St. James's Epistle, v. 12. The Jews seem to have used oaths on the most trifling occasions, deeming that the Third Commandment forbade perjury only.

That oaths are allowable in courts of justice seems clear from the fact that when the high-priest adjured our Blessed Lord by the living God our Lord accepted the oath. So St. Paul calls God to witness repeatedly (Rom. ix. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 31; 2 Cor i. 18, 23, etc.). If men were perfectly truthful oaths need not be administered, but while this solemn attestation of truth is required, it need not be refused by the Christian.

MUIR AND PATERSON, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

KEYS TO CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

Small 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF THE HOLY BIBLE.

By the REV. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., F.S.A.,

EDITOR OF THE "DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY," AND "THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER," AUTHOR OF "HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY," ETC. ETC.

"Another of Mr. Blunt's useful and workmanlike compilations, which will be most acceptable as a household book, or in schools and colleges. It is a capital book too for schoolmasters and pupil teachers. Its subject is arranged under the heads of—I. The Literary History of the Bible. II. Old Testament Writers and Writings. III. New Testament ditto. IV. Revelation and Inspiration. V. Objects of the Bible. VI. Interpretation of ditto. VII. The Bible a guide to Faith. VIII. The Apocrypha. IX. The Apocryphal Books associated with the New Testament. Lastly, there is a serviceable appendix of peculiar Bible words and their meanings."—*Literary Churchman.*

"We have much pleasure in recommending a capital handbook by the learned Editor of 'The Annotated Book of Common Prayer.'"—*Church Times.*

"Merits commendation for the lucid and orderly arrangement in which it presents a considerable amount of valuable and interesting matter."—*Record.*

A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

By the REV. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A.

"Impossible to praise too highly. It is the best short explanation of our offices that we know of, and would be invaluable for the use of candidates for confirmation in the higher classes."—*John Bull.*

"A very valuable and practical manual, full of information, which is admirably calculated to instruct and interest those for whom it was evidently specially intended—the laity of the Church of England. It deserves high commendation."—*Churchman.*

"A thoroughly sound and valuable manual."—*Church Times.*

"To us it appears that Mr. Blunt has succeeded very well. All necessary information seems to be included, and the arrangement is excellent."—*Literary Churchman.*

A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHURCH HISTORY (ANCIENT).

Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A.

"It offers a short and condensed account of the origin, growth, and condition of the Church in all parts of the world, from A.D. 1 down to the end of the fifteenth century. Mr. Blunt's first object has been conciseness, and this has been admirably carried out, and to students of Church history this feature will readily recommend itself. As an elementary work 'A Key' will be specially valuable, inasmuch as it points out certain definite lines of thought, by which those who enjoy the opportunity may be guided in reading the statements of more elaborate histories. At the same time it is but fair to Mr. Blunt to remark that, for general readers, the little volume contains everything that could be consistently expected in a volume of its character. There are many notes, theological, scriptural, and historical, and the 'get up' of the book is specially commendable. As a text-book for the higher forms of schools the work will be acceptable to numerous teachers."—*Public Opinion.*

"It contains some concise notes on Church History, compressed into a small compass, and we think it is likely to be useful as a book of reference."—*John Bull.*

"A very terse and reliable collection of the main facts and incidents connected with Church History."—*Rock.*

A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHURCH HISTORY (MODERN).

Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A.

A KEY TO THE NARRATIVE OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

By JOHN PILKINGTON NORRIS, M.A.

CANON OF BRISTOL, FORMERLY ONE OF HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS.

"This is very much the best book of its kind we have seen. The only fault is its shortness, which prevents its going into the details which would support and illustrate its statements, and which, in the process of illustrating them, would fix them upon the minds and memories of its readers. It is, however, a great improvement upon any book of its kind we know. It bears all the marks of being the condensed work of a real scholar, and of a divine too. The bulk of the book is taken up with a 'Life of Christ,' compiled from the Four Gospels, so as to exhibit its steps and stages and salient points. The rest of the book consists of independent chapters on special points."—*Literary Churchman.*

"This book is no ordinary compendium, no mere 'cram-book;' still less is it an ordinary reading-book for schools; but the schoolmaster, the Sunday-school teacher, and the seeker after a comprehensive knowledge of Divine truth will find it worthy of its name. Canon Norris writes simply, reverently, without great display of learning, giving the result of much careful study in a short compass, and adorning the subject by the tenderness and honesty with which he treats it. . . . We hope that this little book will have a very wide circulation and that it will be studied; and we can promise that those who take it up will not readily put it down again."—*Record.*

"This is a golden little volume. . . . Its design is exceedingly modest. Canon Norris writes primarily to help 'younger students' in studying the Gospels. But this unpretending volume is one which all students may study with advantage. It is an admirable manual for those who take Bible Classes through the Gospels. Closely sifted in style, so that all is clear and weighty; full of unostentatious learning, and pregnant with suggestion; deeply reverent in spirit, and altogether Evangelical in spirit; Canon Norris's book supplies a real want, and ought to be welcomed by all earnest and devout students of the Holy Gospels."—*London Quarterly Review.*

A KEY TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

By JOHN PILKINGTON NORRIS, M.A.

"The book is one which we can heartily recommend."—*Spectator.*

"Few books have ever given us more unmixed pleasure than this."—*Literary Churchman.*

"This is a sequel to Canon Norris's 'Key to the Gospels,' which was published two years ago, and which has become a general favourite with those who wish to grasp the leading features of the life and work of Christ. The sketch of the Acts of the Apostles is done in the same style; there is the same reverent spirit and quiet enthusiasm running through it, and the same instinct for seizing the leading points in the narrative."—*Record.*

A KEY TO CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE & PRACTICE FOUNDED ON THE CHURCH CATECHISM.

By the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A.

"Of cheap and reliable text-books of this nature there has hitherto been a great want. We are often asked to recommend books for use in Church Sunday-Schools, and we therefore take this opportunity of saying that we know of none more likely to be of service both to teachers and scholars than these 'Keys.'" —*Churchman's Shilling Magazine.*

"This is another of Mr. Blunt's most useful manuals, with all the precision of a school book, yet diverging into matters of practical application so freely as to make it most serviceable, either as a teacher's suggestion book, or as an intelligent pupil's reading book."—*Literary Churchman.*

"Will be very useful for the higher classes in Sunday-schools, or rather for the fuller instruction of the Sunday-school teachers themselves, where the parish Priest is wise enough to devote a certain time regularly to their preparation for their voluntary task."—*Union Review.*

RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge.